



17-6.

* THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, *
* Princeton, N. J. *

BR 377 .H8
Hopkins, John Henry, 1792-
1868.
Sixteen lectures on the
causes, principles, and





SIXTEEN LECTURES

ON THE

CAUSES, PRINCIPLES, AND RESULTS,

OF THE

BRITISH REFORMATION.

BY

JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D.D.

Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the Diocese of Vermont.

PHILADELPHIA:

JAMES M. CAMPBELL & CO.

SAXTON & MILES, NEW YORK.

1844.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1844, by

JAMES M. CAMPBELL & Co.

in the Clerk's office of the District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

John C. Clark, Printer.

PREFACE.

THE following lectures were written in A. D., 1840, and were delivered in the parish of the author, St. Paul's Church, Burlington, on the evenings of sixteen successive Sundays, to the apparent satisfaction of a large and somewhat promiscuous congregation.

Being unexpectedly obliged to visit Philadelphia, for the purpose of correcting the press, in the publication of his recent letters to the bishops, clergy and laity of his own communion, the author conceived that he should be performing an acceptable service to the cause of truth, if he availed himself of the opportunity to preach these lectures in that city. And although he foresaw that there might be considerable difficulty in making any arrangement, by which sixteen discourses on the Reformation could be brought within the ~~three~~ weeks required for his own specific business, yet he resolved at least to make the proposal to his brethren, the rectors of the city Churches, and let them decide whether such an effort would be useful.

The result was a very interesting expression of sound views, and fraternal feelings, on the part of the clergy at large. An arrangement was made, by which five of the principal Churches should be occupied in rotation, on the evenings of three successive weeks, so as to complete the whole course within the period allotted to the author's stay. The following Sunday night was fixed for the introductory lecture, the notices were

prepared by a prominent clergyman for the public press, and numerous friendly tongues had already diffused the intelligence far and wide, not merely exciting a certain measure of natural anticipation, but, as the author would fain believe, drawing forth, from many a Christian heart, an offering of gratitude to God for another testimony against error, and a prayer in behalf of the humble instrument by whom it should be given.

It was at this stage of the matter, that the bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the diocese of Pennsylvania, thought fit to address a letter to the author, earnestly and urgently requesting the abandonment of the whole design.

Of this very singular act, there is no desire, on the author's part, to speak unkindly. He has indeed, both in his written answer to the bishop, and in his intercourse with others, denied, as he still denies, the *right* and the *expediency* of the interference. But he yielded to it, for the sake of his brethren of the clergy, whose prompt and generous conduct on the occasion well deserved, that he should make any sacrifice of his personal feelings, rather than be the means of raising the slightest ~~disaffection~~ *disaffection* between them and their diocesan. And he takes this opportunity to record his conviction, in the most explicit terms, that while he considers the course of his respected colleague as being a manifest error in every possible aspect of the question, yet he doubts not that it was dictated by the purest motives, and intended for the best.

The immediate effect, however, was the expression of a general and strong desire, that the lectures, *intended to have been preached*, should at least be *published without delay*. With this desire, after some reflection, the author thought it his duty to comply; although he would have preferred, so far as he was

personally concerned, to have occupied some months in preparing an improved copy for the press; with the addition, (according to his custom in his other humble publications) of the *original notes*, referred to as authority, and of a supplementary lecture or two upon the subject of justification by faith, as contradistinguished from the Tridentine doctrine.

Such being, briefly, the simple history of the present work, the author can only say, that he has done what he could, under the circumstances, to render his references satisfactory. For many of the passages, especially those taken from the ancient fathers, he has cited his former book on the Church of Rome, because it is more accessible than the originals themselves, and contains copious extracts from them, made with care and accuracy. For others, he has referred to a very useful English work, Finch on the Roman controversy, which ought to be, if it is not, in general circulation. And he has made several quotations from the admirable Letters of Dr. Philpots to Butler, worthy, in every respect, of the reputation which the distinguished writer has long enjoyed, as bishop of Exeter. But for the substantial truth and correctness of the whole, the author considers himself directly ~~and~~ stands prepared to defend ~~the~~ ground which he has occupied in any form of equal controversy, excepting always the utterly inconclusive and objectionable one of newspaper discussion.

On the propriety, the expediency, the right, and—more than all—*the solemn duty* of defending the principles of the Reformation against the constant assaults of the Church of Rome, the author feels quite persuaded that there can be, amongst Protestant Christians, but one opinion. The legitimate modes of performing this duty, so far as the ministry of our Church are concerned, are three: by public disputation, by the pulpit,

and by the press. **BY THESE, THE TRUTH WAS ESTABLISHED.** By these, the same truth must be maintained. And woe be to the Church, if the fear of excitement, or the apprehension of consequences, directly or indirectly, should ever be allowed to silence the tongue of the advocate, who seeks, in the old and regular forms of ministerial action, with sufficient preparation and in a Christian spirit, to discharge his share of this sacred responsibility.

Whether the author has erred in supposing himself called to labour in this trying and ungrateful department of the ministerial office; whether the zealous studies of eighteen years have failed to qualify him in any reasonable measure for the task, and whether he was altogether mistaken in the idea, that the following course of lectures, under the divine blessing, might have borne a useful testimony on behalf of our Protestant truth against Roman error, *especially adapted to these times*, are all questions which he willingly submits to the judgment of his brethren. Should that judgment be against him, he will pray for the grace of resignation, and endeavour to obey the Saviour's precept: **GO, AND SIN NO MORE.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS.



FIRST LECTURE.

	Page
The Reformation—its results—plan of the course, - -	1—10

SECOND LECTURE.

The Rule of faith, as stated by the Church of England, -	11—25
--	-------

THIRD LECTURE.

The Rule of faith, as maintained by the Church of Rome,	26—40
---	-------

FOURTH LECTURE.

Roman doctrine of tradition and infallibility, - - -	41—61
--	-------

FIFTH LECTURE.

Roman doctrine disproved by Scripture and the fathers, -	62—87
--	-------

SIXTH LECTURE.

The Roman doctrine of papal supremacy, - - -	88—114
--	--------

SEVENTH LECTURE.

The doctrine of papal supremacy disproved by the fathers,	115—142
---	---------

EIGHTH LECTURE.

The history of papal supremacy, - - - -	143—167
---	---------

NINTH LECTURE.

The Roman doctrine of anathema and persecution, - -	168—195
---	---------

TENTH LECTURE.

The Roman doctrine of celibacy, and sketch of monachism,	196—226
--	---------

ELEVENTH LECTURE.

The Roman doctrine concerning the worship of the virgin and the saints, - - - - -	227—262
--	---------

TWELFTH LECTURE.

The Roman doctrine concerning the worship of relics, images, &c. - - - - -	263—288
---	---------

THIRTEENTH LECTURE.

The Roman doctrine of purgatory, satisfaction, and indul- gences, - - - - -	290—313
--	---------

FOURTEENTH LECTURE.

The history and present state of the doctrine of purgatory and indulgences, - - - - -	314—344
--	---------

FIFTEENTH LECTURE.

The Roman doctrine of transubstantiation—its history, &c.	345—361
---	---------

SIXTEENTH LECTURE.

The same refuted from the fathers—recapitulation—con- clusion, - - - - -	362—397
---	---------

LECTURE I.

JUDE 3.—Ye should contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.

THREE hundred years, my brethren, have nearly rolled away, since the glorious Reformation worked so vast a change in the character of Christendom. Liberty of thought, liberty of speech, liberty of action, were established, where despotism the most absolute had for centuries prevailed. The rights of conscience, after a long and fearful struggle, triumphed over the force of superstition. The marvellous empire of the Papacy, which had attained a height far above the loftiest earthly throne, lost its dazzling lustre, and the iron rod of its dominion was broken, as it was fondly hoped, to bruise no more.

I shall not occupy your time by an attempt to develop the results of the revolution, which this great event accomplished in the civil and the mental history of man. How the hard-won jewel of religious freedom glanced its varied light upon every other subject, and gave a portion of its own hue to all the processes of thought;—how every region of philosophy felt the inspiring influence, and intellectual life, in all its freshness and its energy, burst forth, rejoicing, from the trammels which had fettered it so long;—how civil despotism, and every form of prescriptive injustice, were compelled to listen to the voice of bold remonstrance, until, one after another, the hoary abuses of time-honoured tyranny were abandoned, and government was acknowledged to be, not a prerogative insti-

tuted for the aggrandizement of the few, but a solemn trust held for the benefit of the many;—how these and similar advantages in the whole complicated frame-work of society were the consequences, directly or indirectly, of the Reformation, has been often proved by far more eloquent tongues than mine; and it is no part of my present purpose to repeat the demonstration. Rather let me confine myself to the track which belongs to my office, and inquire what has been the result upon those interests which so far transcend the highest aims of earthly sagacity—the interests of the Church of God.

And here, my brethren, a field opens upon us, vast in extent, and pre-eminently worthy of examination. To traverse it, however, in the hope of making a perfect and complete survey, would need a knowledge of the past and present state of Christendom which no one man possesses. All that I can pretend to perform must be a far more humble undertaking. The corruptions, doctrinal and practical, which were the exciting causes of the Reformation, the principles on which it was conducted, especially in our mother Church of England, and the effects produced upon the Church of Rome, and upon those leading Protestant communions with which we are best acquainted, will form a circle of topics quite large enough for our contemplated course; and of these, the first only will demand an elaborate consideration.

But I beg leave to premise—and I trust the unavoidable egotism of the statement may be pardoned—that although these lectures will, of necessity, bear somewhat of a controversial aspect, yet are they commenced in no spirit of unkindness to the Church of Rome, or to any other Church of Christendom. I do indeed profess myself a firm believer in the one Catholic or Universal Church of the Redeemer, which forms a distinct article of the primitive creed; but I have long cherished the opinion that all orthodox believers are members of

that Church, whatever may be the diversities of their particular communion. The cardinal truths which form that simple creed, and in which all Christians concur, seem to my mind greatly to outweigh the minor points on which they differ; and, therefore, while I desire to hold the truth on every subject, and regard every distinction which tends to divide the followers of Christ as a sore evil, yet would I endeavour, at all times, to remember the far weightier matters in which they agree, and thus realize a measure of Christian charity, even when compelled to utter the language of reprehension.

It is, I am aware, supposed by many, that such an acknowledgment renders controversy unnecessary, because if men may be saved whether they are in all respects right or wrong, the attempt to set them right in non-essential matters is hardly worth the trouble. But no one argues thus on any thing else except religion. All men, for example, belong to the same human family, and agree in the great essentials of their nature; and yet, since none can be perfect, either in body, or in mind, or in circumstances, the whole labour of life is directed to improve them. For who would say that the healthy man has no superiority over the diseased? that the man with all his bodily members possesses no advantage over him who is maimed or mutilated? or that the man of education and refinement has no better lot than the ignorant and debased? Nay, to what is the entire range of human science and industry directed, if it be not to elevate the social and individual condition of those who are yet admitted to be the children of the same common father? Indeed, so far is it from being true, that because my neighbour is a man as well as I, therefore it is not worth my while to rectify his mistakes and enlarge his knowledge, that the direct contrary would be my proper rule of duty. It is precisely because he is my fellow, that I am bound to lead him out of error, and do him all the good I can. Now, surely, on the same principle, my ac-

knowledging all Christians as members of the same spiritual household, which is the Catholic or Universal Church, does by no means require that I should justify the errors of their system, but the contrary; since the more disposed I feel to regard them as belonging to the great family of Christ, the more anxious I must be to behold them united in sentiment. Besides which, all error is dangerous, even though it be not fatal. Truth alone is safe. Most absurd, then, would it seem, to contend for the better health of the body, and yet be silent as to the diseases of the soul. Most preposterous to be sensitive to all the disorders of the civil government, and yet be indifferent to the errors of any portion of the Church of God; for these errors, and the strifes growing out of them, form a constant theme of reproach against religion, and not only hinder the peace of Christians themselves, but are a standing obstacle to the diffusion of the gospel.

We are far, however, from admitting, that the divisions of Christians ought to have an effect so injurious to the progress of Christianity. However hostile they must needs be to the full joy and comfort of spiritual life, we cannot see any force in the infidel assumption, that if the Bible were divine, there could be but one mind amongst all that receive it. For it is obvious, that the corruption of human nature, which converts the very gospel of peace into an instrument of discord, is equally active in perverting and abusing every other gift of God. Is not the blessed sun in the heavens the work of an Almighty hand, and yet does not man compel it, as it were, to look on deeds of darkness? Is not human reason a gift of God, and are not men continually degrading it in the defence of folly? Are not our bodies the workmanship of God, and are they not, nevertheless, given over, too often, to the service of iniquity? What gift of divine goodness does not man pervert and abuse as well as religion? On what science or art are men universally agreed any more than on religion? Most

confidently may it be answered, *None*, if the numbers engaged in them, and the subject matter, be taken respectively into consideration. It is, therefore, after all, no more than what ought to be expected, that religion, though indeed divine and perfect in its unity, so far as God, its glorious author, is concerned, should be subject to the universal calamity of human nature, partial misapprehension, division and strife, on the side of man.

And may we not further remark, in the analogy before us, that the goodness of God does not immediately withdraw his gifts even when men abuse them. The sun does not refuse to shine upon those who pervert the blessing. The faculty of reason is not overthrown as soon as it is prostituted to the defence of evil. The springs of life and health are not forthwith dried up, because the libertine and the profligate pollute them by iniquity. And just so is it in religion, that the mercy of God continues to vouchsafe the revelation of his truth and the influences of his Spirit to the children of men, notwithstanding their sad propensity, in every age, to adulterate the pure gold of divine authority with the miserable dross of human invention. Wretched, indeed, would be our lot, if the rule of heavenly compassion were less indulgent than it is; for if the Lord were strict to mark every transgression, if every deviation from his truth worked a forfeiture of the whole, what Church or what man could stand before Him?

But—to return from what may seem to be a digression—there are in my mind some especial reasons, why I should select the causes, principles and results of the Reformation, as the peculiar subject of our Christian interest at the present time. First, because the aspect of the religious world, at this moment, presents the very same elements of controversy, only under varied forms of practical application, which agitated all Europe three hundred years ago. The Church of Rome then insisted that her system was the only exponent of the faith

once delivered to the saints by the inspired apostles of Christ. The Reformers, on the other hand, denied the truth of this assumption, and averred that the primitive system had become changed, deformed and corrupted in her keeping. The Church of Rome claimed the exclusive title of Catholic, and branded all without her pale as cut off from Christ as heretics, guilty of mortal sin. The Reformers denied that she had the exclusive right to the name of Catholic, or Universal, maintained that the term Catholic grew into use amongst the primitive Christians in the second and third centuries, and that they themselves were in far truer agreement with Christianity, as it was then understood by the Church of Rome herself, than the modern Church of Rome under the Papal system. Now these contrarieties are still asserted as strongly as ever, and therefore the necessity for defending the ground taken by our forefathers, is in no respect done away.

Secondly, however, the peculiar position of our own Church seems to call for a much more general and complete discussion of this controversy on our part, in justice to others as well as to ourselves. For in the wilderness of jarring opinions throughout the Christian world, we regard our Church as placed between extremes, far removed from the Church of Rome on the one part, not a little from many of the various modern Churches on the other, and therefore liable, of course, to be misunderstood and misrepresented by all. But if this be, in some respects, a disadvantageous position, in other respects we should regard it as a privilege which involves a special responsibility, because the voice of truth, coming from the centre, is more likely to be heard on either side; and thus, under God, we might hope that it would produce a better and a holier influence.

And thirdly, I must acknowledge—though with much regret—that the difficulty of finding a thorough, and yet temperate and friendly discussion of this deeply important subject,

has been my strongest motive to the work of controversy. The Roman priesthood, ever since the days of Bossuet, have pursued a course in all Protestant countries, which makes it by no means easy, even for a cultivated intellect, to understand their real principles. Adopting the words of the apostle, *Being crafty, I caught you with guile*, they have applied them to a totally different purpose, by presenting their doctrines and their history under a modern and specious garb, far more inviting and plausible than truth would sanction; and thus they have prevailed on many an ardent and noble mind, to think them a sadly misrepresented and persecuted people. With such admirable agreement and adroitness have they pursued this plan, that even our own peace has been somewhat disturbed by it. Even some churchmen of unquestionable learning and talent, as well in England as amongst ourselves, yielding to a generous though misguided feeling, have devoted themselves to the defence of Rome, as of an injured party, and openly maintained that there was far less need of the Reformation, and far less benefit derived from its success, than was commonly supposed; that strictly considered, there was but little substantial difference between the Roman and the Anglican systems, and that re-union with Rome, *even as she now is*, was not impossible. The startling demonstrations of this strange hypothesis during the last few years, in our mother Church especially, have excited a fresh interest in the real merits of the controversy; and have made it necessary for all men who would not be deficient in Christian intelligence, to ascertain, with candour and with fairness, the precise limits of truth. To minister to this necessity, with honesty and frankness, but without prejudice or asperity, and thus supply an acknowledged defect of satisfactory information, is a main object of the following course. I trust, therefore, that in these lectures, you will find truth and kindness linked faithfully together. The spiritual interests of the Christian are never advancing,

when the intellect triumphs at the expense of the heart; for, as saith the apostle, *knowledge puffeth up*, BUT CHARITY EDIFIETH.

The plan of our course may next demand a brief explanation. It will be the same in substance, as that which has been pursued by the learned Dr. Wiseman, whose lectures in defence of the Church of Rome are the most recent, and perhaps I may add, the most plausible of the present day. The writer, for some years, filled the honourable post of Rector of the English College at Rome, where he attained a distinguished rank amongst the accomplished scholars of Europe. His lectures were delivered in London, first in 1835, and again in 1836. They were published soon afterwards in England, and republished in the United States; and their importance has been enhanced by the appointment of their author to be one of the papal Vicars Apostolic, with the title of Bishop, *in partibus infidelium*.

I do not design, however, to content myself with merely taking the statement of Roman Catholic doctrine from this writer, nor from any of the controversialists of the present age; because it is a part of my design to show the change which the Reformation has wrought in the Church of Rome herself: and therefore I shall set before you the acts of their councils, the dogmata of their schoolmen, the declarations and bulls of the Popes, their canon laws, their authorized forms of worship, their catechisms, their breviary, the statements of their historians, and of their distinguished bishops; pursuing in every instance, the rule laid down by the courts of justice in all civilized nations, viz: that *the best evidence of which the nature of the case admits*, shall be given. On our side we shall adduce, first, the authority of the Scriptures, and next the testimony of the earlier fathers which the Church of Rome has herself handed down to us, whose names are placed upon her list of saints, and inscribed with honour in her canon law.

And I trust, my brethren, that the result of the whole will be not only a reasonable measure of important religious knowledge, but an increase of your gratitude to God for the privileges which your own branch of the Universal or Catholic Church secures to you, and a correspondent increase of your zeal for "the faith once delivered to the saints." Yet along with these, I would fain hope that one of the fruits of our labour may be an increase of charity towards those who differ from us; that charity which willingly thinketh no evil, and rejoiceth only in the truth. If I had not this hope, I should lose all relish for the work I have undertaken. Controversy, God knows, has had too much to do with the carnal weapons of acrimony, and sarcasm, and slander, and a studied effort to put every thing connected with the adversary in the most odious light. Be ours the endeavour, made at least in humble sincerity, to use only the spiritual weapons of candour, sobriety and moderation. Thus only can our task be approved by the Prince of peace. Thus only can we ask that the God of truth and love will grant it his blessing.

In concluding this introductory discourse, my beloved brethren, I have two requests to make, which I trust you will not deny me. The one is, that you will not expect the discussion to be enlivened by any of those tales of pious frauds, of inquisitorial cruelty, of monastic atrocity, and conventual abomination, which multitudes have been in the habit of connecting with all their ideas of the Church of Rome, but which fair and candid minds dismiss at once, as having no proper place in well regulated controversy. I do not mean to question the truth of the facts which historians relate in connexion with these subjects. The Church of Rome has held the most prominent place in the Christian world ever since the days of the apostle Paul, and it would be strange indeed if many abuses could not be found in her history, especially as several centuries of that history were passed among the dark ages of feudal

tyranny and ignorance. But *principles* and *doctrines* are the most proper topics of religious discussion. Practices which did not necessarily flow from principles, and errors which are lamented as grievous abuses by Roman Catholics themselves, and which are confined to particular persons or grew out of particular circumstances, may indeed furnish very interesting materials for the poet, the novelist, or the historian, but deserve no serious notice in our contemplated undertaking.

My other request is founded upon a high authority, the example of the great apostle, when he said to his Thessalonian converts, BRETHREN, PRAY FOR US. (1 Thes. v. 25.) Who giveth wisdom, knowledge, sound discretion, patient research, and that peculiar power which penetrates the veil of ingenious sophistry, and discovers the hidden truth, but God alone? Grant me then, my beloved brethren, what none can need more than I do, the aid of your prayers; that the humble enterprise commenced in the service of the Church of Christ, may have the guidance of his grace, and be made an instrument, in some small degree, for the promotion of his glory.

LECTURE II.

1 TIM. iii. 15.—The Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.

IN entering, my beloved brethren, upon the course of lectures to which I pledged myself, under favour of Divine Providence, in my last discourse, the first subject which demands our attention is the fundamental question of the **RULE OF FAITH**; or, in other words, *by what authority our faith must be governed*; whether by the Holy Scriptures, or by the tradition of the Church. This forms the leading topic of the Roman controversy in our own day, as it did at the period of the Reformation.

Perhaps no question has ever given rise to more argument than this, or has been liable to more ingenious sophistry and mystification, on account of the various senses in which its terms have been understood, and the skill with which the advocates of the Church of Rome have mingled truth and error. In order, therefore, that we may form a clear conception of the whole argument, it will be necessary, as a preliminary, to fix in our minds a distinct idea of what we mean by the Holy Scriptures and the Church.

By the Holy Scriptures, or the Bible, we understand a collection of sacred books, put forth from the days of Moses until the latter years of the apostle John, at the suggestion or command of God himself, by various holy men, whom the Spirit of God guided and superintended in such wise, that the

writings thus produced were perfectly free from all error, and therefore were justly entitled to be received, not as the work of man, but as the recorded WORD OF GOD. In this statement there is an universal agreement amongst all Christians; and the only point of serious difference between the Church of Rome and ourselves, is confined to the question, whether certain books, which we esteem of doubtful inspiration, should have been included with the rest in the sacred Canon, by the Council of Trent which sat in the sixteenth century, against the authority of the ancient fathers and councils of a much earlier day.

The other term, Church, is not susceptible of being defined with equal simplicity. The word itself, in the original languages in which the Bible is written, signifies the assembly, or the congregation; and it is applied to the same subjects in various relations, two only of which, however, it will be necessary to set forth on the present occasion.

The first of these is the Church Catholic, or Universal, being the whole body of the professed people of God, from righteous Abel down to the last believer, who shall be alive when the trumpet of the Archangel summons the entire family of man before the judgment seat of Christ. Of this Church we read, under many dispensations; the patriarchal, the Mosaic, and the New Testament, or Christian dispensation as it is commonly called, although, in fact, these three are only the stages of its development; the successive unfoldings of the truth, manifested in the beautiful order established by the divine wisdom, while the substance of that truth was still the same. To satisfy the reflecting mind of this substantial unity, it is only necessary to remember, that the promise of Christ, and the institution of sacrifice as a type of the Lamb of God which should take away the sins of the world, were given immediately after the fall. Hence the Redeemer is called, the *Lamb slain from the foundation of the world*. Abel, the son

of Adam, is adduced by St. Paul as an example of faith. Enoch was translated in proof of a higher and immortal state, and prophesied, according to St. Jude, of the future judgment. Noah was a preacher of the righteousness of faith, and the ark that saved him from the waters of the deluge was a symbol of the Church of God; while Melchisedec was an eminent and peculiar type of the eternity, sovereignty, and priesthood of Jesus Christ, and Abraham was called the friend of God and the father of the faithful. Throughout the subsequent, or the Mosaic dispensation, all was arranged with reference to Christ. Israel was the Church, and the prophets foretold, with increasing clearness, the calling of the Gentiles at the coming of Him who was to be *the Light of the Gentiles and the glory of his people Israel*. And, therefore, in strict accordance with this unity, St. Paul tells the Romans that they were grafted on the stock of Abraham, that Israel was the root, that the Gentiles were grafted upon that root instead of the natural branches, and that the time should come when those natural branches, which had been cut off by reason of unbelief, should be grafted in again, and all be one in the Redeemer. Hence the phrase *Catholic Church*, or *Universal Church*, taken in its widest latitude as comprehending the body of Christ, includes, properly, all who embraced the covenant of grace, under each successive dispensation, from the beginning of the world: and although, for ordinary purposes and in common parlance, it is usual to apply this phrase to the whole Church under the present dispensation only, since the former dispensations, having fulfilled their part, are done away, yet there are many passages of the Book of God, and many doctrines and usages of the Church, which cannot be properly understood, without a clear idea of its real and comprehensive signification.

The second application of the word Church, is to a part of the universal body, whether that part be greater or less.

A few examples of both these significations will explain the distinction clearly.

Thus, for instance, our Saviour saith, (Matt. xviii. 15—17) “If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto *the Church*; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.” Here it is evident that our Lord does not mean, that the Universal or Catholic Church was to be told of every offence which an individual might commit against his brother, for this would be equally absurd and impossible. But the word Church means the assembly or congregation to which the parties belonged; that is, a very small, but yet distinctly organized fraction of the whole.

On another occasion, however, our Lord saith, (Matt. xvi. 18) “On this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” Now here we are bound to give to the word that wide scope of meaning, which comprehends the final victory of the Universal or Catholic Church over the powers of darkness.

Again, when St. Stephen, (Acts vii. 38) in his last disputation with the Jews, just before his martyrdom, saith; “This is that Moses that was in the Church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in Mount Sinai and with our fathers,” it is manifest that he applies the word Church to ancient Israel, the Church under the Mosaic dispensation. But when St. Paul saith, (Eph. v. 25) that “Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it,” and again, (Col. i. 18) that “He is the head of the body, the Church,” and again, in the words of our text, when he speaks to Timothy of “the Church of the living God, which is the pillar and ground of the truth,”

we are to understand the whole Church, the Church Catholic or Universal.

From this necessary latitude in the meaning of the word Church, we should expect to find it often mentioned merely in respect to its locality. Thus we read, in the first epistle of St. Peter, (v. 13) of the Church at Babylon. St. Paul speaks of the Church of Laodicea, (Col. iv. 16) the Church at Cenchrea, (Rom. xvi. 1) the Church of God at Corinth. (1 Cor. i. 2.) Nay, he diminishes the term so far as to address himself to the Church in the house of Philemon. (Phil. 2.) In like manner, we find the Spirit of God in the Book of Revelations, addressing the Church of Ephesus, of Smyrna, of Pergamus, of Thyatira, of Sardis, of Philadelphia, of Laodicea. And it is, accordingly, the current style of the apostles to speak of Churches in the plural number. "The Churches of Christ salute you," saith St. Paul. (Rom. xvi. 16.) "So ordain I," saith he elsewhere, (1 Cor. vii. 17) "in all the Churches." He speaks of the Churches of Asia, (1 Cor. xvi. 19) the Churches of Galatia, (1 Cor. xvi. 1) the Churches of Macedonia, (2 Cor. viii. 1) the Churches of Judea. (Gal. i. 22.) And in the same strain we read, (Rev. ii. 7) "*He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches.*" It may perhaps seem to you, my brethren, that I am taking needless trouble to prove a very simple proposition. But you will find, before the conclusion of these discourses, that the sense in which this word is to be understood, has a very important bearing, not only on the doctrine of our rule of faith, but on many other points involved in the Roman controversy.

Having thus shown the meaning of the terms employed in the statement of our rule of faith, I shall now proceed to the rule itself, as it is expressed in the Articles of the Church of England, and in those of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

The sixth Article has for its title, "*The sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for salvation,*" and is in the following words:—

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church."

Here, you perceive, is a direct reference to the Church, and that in a comprehensive sense, including the whole Church under the Christian dispensation. But there are other Articles which expressly treat of the Church and its authority; and these it will be necessary to cite, in order that the whole standard of our faith may be placed before you.

The 19th Article defines the Church in the following words: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."

In this definition it does not appear that the Universal or Catholic Church was in view at all, but rather that which should constitute a Church in any particular part of Christ's kingdom, as for example, the Church of a single city, or province, or nation.

The 20th Article sets forth the authority of the Church in these words:

"The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith, and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church

be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so, besides the same, ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation.”

If we suppose that a provincial or national Church were intended in the 10th Article, then nothing hinders us from applying the same sense to the word Church in the 20th; although it would as well justify the more comprehensive signification of the Church Universal. There are yet two other Articles, however, which bear upon the point in question.

The 21st, treating of the authority of General Councils, saith, that “when they be gathered together, forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed by the Spirit and Word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.”

Here we have a strong denial of any authority in General Councils, independent of the written Word of God. The respect due to them as expounders of the Scriptures, is a totally different question, which we shall have occasion to consider more at large by and by. It is proper to observe, however, that the whole of this Article was omitted in the American Church, although not for any reason which would affect its general doctrine.

Lastly, the 34th Article, speaking of the traditions of the Church, uses these words :

“It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like, for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men’s manners, so that nothing be ordained against God’s Word. Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the tra-

ditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to God's Word, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, (that others may fear to do the like,) as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren. Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done unto edifying."

In this Article there is an express limitation upon the exercise of private judgment, coupled with as express a declaration of the power of a particular or national Church over rites and ceremonies; yet here, as every where else, there is the utmost deference inculcated towards the Bible.

There is a part of the English law, however, although it is not expressed in the Articles, and has no formal recognition in the system of the American Church, which I consider important to a perfect understanding of our doctrine concerning the rule of faith. And this is the provision, that Scripture shall be expounded according to the sense of the ancient fathers. The same principle indeed appears throughout the Homilies, and is plainly set forth in the Preface to the English Book of Common Prayer. And although our Church in the United States, whether considered politically, or ecclesiastically, is a distinct and independent body, yet the religious principles of the Church of England are for the most part so identified with ours, that the defence of one is the defence of both. This unity is well expressed in the Preface to our American Book of Common Prayer, where it is said, that our Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship, or further than local circumstances require.

The limits of this discourse will only allow of a very brief discussion of some of the more important questions arising out of those Articles, and essential to a proper understanding of the

Roman controversy. But that we may proceed as far as practicable without trespassing too long, I shall ask your attention while I state the objections made to our rule of faith by Dr. Wiseman, and his brother advocates of the Church of Rome.

They strongly object that the right of private judgment, by which every man is at liberty to gather his own faith out of the Scriptures, is productive of endless diversity, confusion, and error in religion; and they point triumphantly to the number of sects which distract the Protestant part of Christendom, as proof positive of the assertion.

They say that we are indebted to them for the very Bible on which we rest our faith, and that it is unreasonable to trust them for this, and yet trust them no farther.

And they insist that there is no other practicable mode of attaining Christian unity, than that laid down in their own system.

Now, in order to appreciate the force of these objections, we shall have to ask your attention to several lectures, in the course of which they shall be fully discussed. For the present, however, we shall only briefly examine the following topics, all of which, as you will readily perceive, bear upon the line of the Roman argument.

First then, let us consider the right and absolute necessity of the exercise of private judgment, or in other words, the exercise by every individual of his own faculties in the question of religion, upon the truth propounded to him from the Word of God.

Secondly, the degree of credit due to the Church in faithfully handing down to us the volume of inspiration.

Thirdly, the authority to be conceded to the primitive Church, in the character of judges or interpreters of the sense of Scripture.

And fourthly, the restriction of the right of private judgment to the duty of selecting, each man for himself, that Church

which appears to have retained most faithfully the distinguishing marks of Scriptural or Apostolic Christianity.

I doubt not, my brethren, that you will find this course of argument somewhat trying to your patience, and yet I forewarn you, that throughout our whole contemplated series as well as here, the establishment of truth can only be fully attained by close and thorough reflection. A vague and superficial notion of religion may indeed be acquired without the trouble of thought, but clear and distinct views absolutely demand, as they most richly repay, persevering and laborious investigation.

First then, as to the right and necessity of private judgment, I aver that the Lord himself addresses his sacred truth to no other principle. "Come now, and let us reason together," is his language. "Turn ye, for why will ye die," is his expostulation. "Unto you, O men, I call," saith the wisdom of heaven, "and my voice is to the sons of men." "Come unto me," saith the compassionate Redeemer, "all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest." To what are all these and thousands of similar passages directed? Is it not to the private judgment, the individual powers of sensation and thought which the hand of God has bestowed upon us? True, these faculties are not sufficient to bring men to repentance and faith without the operation of the Holy Spirit, but with that influence to open the eyes which are blind, and the ears which are deaf by nature, is it any thing else which prepares the sinner for the service of God, but the reception of the Word of God, by his own individual assent to its truth and power?

I do not deny that the imposing spectacle of the Church, visibly and prosperously established before men, with her ministry, her order, and her mighty sway, is calculated to attract attention and excite respect, and thus become a motive for the examination of the divine proclamation of mercy, propounded to mankind upon the authority of God's own Word.

But when Abel yielded his heart in faith—when Noah prepared the ark—when Abraham left his kindred to be an exile in the land of Canaan—when Moses went back to Egypt as the deliverer of Israel—when Elijah thought himself alone in the midst of idolatry and profanation—when the apostles saw their hopes quenched in the darkness of their beloved Master's sepulchre—when St. Paul wandered about from city to city, disputing in the markets, teaching in the synagogue, or leading the Athenians on Mars Hill to contemplate the attributes of the unknown God—where, in all these instances was the Church, to aid the private judgment of the individual in deciding upon the truth of the word of inspiration? Nay, is it not demonstrable, from the necessity of the case, that the Word of God, embraced through the operation of his grace by the private judgment, must be anterior to the Church, since the Church consists of a company or society of believers, and in the nature of things, individual belief must go before the formation of any such society?

But to us who live after the full organization of the Church, it may be said that the order of the whole question is changed, because we are now obliged to take, through the medium of the Church, what was originally received by an extraordinary communication. This, however, only alters our mode of arriving at the standard of our faith, without at all affecting the standard itself; since it is obvious that whether the will of God be delivered to me by the word or by the pen of the inspired instrument, I am equally bound to receive it. And whether the word of God be delivered to me by evangelists and apostles in person, or be transmitted in writing through the channel of the Church, its authority and my submission to it must be the same, and the exercise of private judgment in either case must be equally indispensable.

Here, however, two questions arise, in which correct ideas of the Church become of the highest importance. One of them

respects her credit, as the witness and keeper of Holy Writ, the other regards her claim to be its best interpreter.

The first question resolves itself into the simplest form, when it is considered that the Church, or the body of Christ's faithful people, must of necessity, be the only safe guardian of the Scriptures, because none but the Church could have had any serious motive for their preservation, and to her they were the very charter of all her hope. It is saying nothing to the purpose, therefore, to tell us that we are indebted to the Church for the Bible, since the Bible could have descended to us in no other way; and in receiving it from the Church we have all the evidence that the case allows, and can ask no more. The first Churches obtained their Canon of Scripture from apostolic authority, and handed it down with religious care to each succeeding generation, so that by this simple yet necessary principle of transmission, we have the very word of inspiration in its own integrity, whatever else may have been liable to change.

The second question, namely, the claim of the Church to be the interpreter of Scripture, is a totally different matter, and yet it is one which, to a reflecting and unprejudiced mind, could never have been made the subject of a doubt, with regard to those points in which the judgment of the Church has been harmonious. For all must allow that the first Christians, who had the privilege of the inspired apostles' teaching for years, possessed advantages altogether superior to ourselves in ascertaining the mind of the Spirit. Titus, the first bishop of Crete, for example, and Timothy, the first bishop of Ephesus, were instructed by St. Paul for the express work of the ministry. Who would refuse them a peculiar veneration for that very reason, if it were possible to hear their preaching at the present day? Or if their favourite disciples, to whom they had communicated the results of their familiar intercourse with the great apostle, were now before us, who could per-

suade us that they were not the safest guides for the soul? It is not, therefore, an assumption without argument, but a plain deduction of common sense, that the nearer we can approach to the apostolic fountain, the more highly we must esteem the opinions or judgment of the Church. But the first generation of teachers after the apostles were too much occupied in doing and suffering, to leave many written memorials behind them. And the remains even of the second are not numerous. As the progress of the Church advanced, indeed, they multiplied, and highly do we estimate them all. But we find a want of unanimity amongst them, which totally forbids that we should think them free from error. So early as the second century, for instance, soon after the death of the apostle John, we behold them disputing about the time for holding the festival of Easter. Further dissensions concerning the baptism of heretics spring up in the third century, and in the beginning of the fourth, the first General Council is summoned by the Emperor Constantine, to compose the strife which convulsed the Church upon the all-important subject of the Trinity, and the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ. In all their disputations, however, we find them unanimous in appealing to the Scriptures as the standard of faith. Tradition, indeed, was sometimes called upon in the way of corroborative interpretation, but the decisive evidences of truth were only sought for in the Bible. Nothing, therefore, can be more manifest to the unprejudiced student of antiquity than this: that the primitive Christians made the Bible their infallible rule of faith, as we do, and used the help of tradition on the very same ground that we ourselves allow, namely, as being entitled to the highest respect in the interpretation of the Bible, but nothing more.

From this brief statement, which we shall have to enlarge on and verify in a future discourse, it results undeniably, that the claims of the Bible to be received above all other rules or standards of faith as alone infallible, are sustained not

only by the fact that it is the sure record of the Word of God, but by the unanimous consent of the primitive fathers. So that when we rest our faith on the same foundation, we are justified, first, by the reason of the thing itself, and, secondly, by the concurrent admission of those who had the advantage of living so much nearer than ourselves to the apostolic day. And the authority which should be conceded to the primitive Church, in the character of judges or interpreters of Scripture, is readily resolved in the same way. For surely the reverence which we yield to the ancient fathers cannot, in justice, go beyond the reverence which they claimed for themselves, or which they accorded to each other. As judges and interpreters of the Written word of God, they have our absolute confidence wherever they are unanimous. But where they are not unanimous, we are compelled to do as they did—compare their discordant sentiments with Scripture, and adopt that sense which seems most conformable to the language of inspiration.

In determining the last question, as to the obligation resting on all men, according to their light and opportunity, to select their Church for themselves, we can be at no loss to discover the argument furnished by the same recurrence to antiquity. For since, in some things, the infallible standard of the Scriptures has been interpreted by different portions of the Church in different ways, so that in agreeing with one party, we must perforce differ from another; what have we but our own judgment, under God, to decide for us between them? Or who shall deprive us of the privilege of obeying the apostles' precept—"Prove all things, hold fast that which is good?"

I may not, however, conclude even this cursory view of the principles set forth by our Articles on the rule of faith, without directing your attention to the wholesome limits provided for this exercise of private judgment. It is the plain doctrine of

our Church, that those things which are necessary to salvation are not only declared in Scripture, but are settled of old in the interpretation and judgment of the primitive Church, as by the several creeds, which are accordingly laid down as immovable landmarks in our system. Those points which are not essential to salvation, and which different portions of the Universal Church have settled differently, are nevertheless to be received and followed for the sake of peace and order by the members of each particular Church, just as that Church to which they belong has seen good to direct them. Allowance, therefore, is given to private judgment, to choose which Church it will adopt; but no allowance is given to differ from all for the sake of setting up a novelty, and thereby casting a new brand of dissension into Christ's kingdom, on account of some comparatively trifling matter which belongs not to the integrity of the faith. Here then, you perceive, we allow all Christian liberty, but no licentiousness; the right to purify the old temple, but not to build a new one; the privilege and even the duty of bringing the Church as nearly as possible to the apostolic standard of the early faith of Christendom, but no privilege for the tongue of censorious non-conformity, or the hand of wanton innovation.

I have only to add, my brethren, that the subject before us has been handled but slightly in many respects, because it is so complicated with that of our next lecture—the rule of faith propounded by the Church of Rome—that the discussion of their doctrine will necessarily throw additional light and evidence upon our own. Meanwhile, may the Spirit of the only living and true God direct and sanctify you, that you may not merely acknowledge the standard of the faith, but may appropriate the faith itself, so as to know by your own experience how it works by love, and purifies the heart, and overcomes the world.

LECTURE III.

1 COR. iii. 3.—For ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying and strife and divisions; are ye not carnal, and walk as men?

THE subject of our last discourse, my brethren, was the Rule of Faith, which, in contradistinction to the modern Church of Rome, was established by the Church of England at the Reformation; and which, as you will probably remember, reduced the whole of the faith required for salvation, to the Bible alone. We explained what we understood by the Holy Scriptures, and then stated some of the various senses in which the term Church was to be received. We asserted the right and the necessity of the exercise of private judgment, as the unalienable privilege and obligation of every individual; since, without it, neither repentance, nor faith, nor obedience, nor any other commanded duty, could be possible to man. We stated, nevertheless, that wherever the judgment of the Church was unanimous on any point of Christian faith or practice, no individual opinion could be allowed to have any weight; but, that, wherever the judgment of the Church was not unanimous, the appeal to Scripture, and the humble and faithful use of our own faculties, with a submissive reliance on the aid of the Holy Spirit, was the only resource of those who were the appointed guides of their brethren. We cited, at large, those Articles of our Church which had a bearing on the subject, and we then left the further discussion of it to the present lecture, where, in examining the Roman rule of faith,

the difference between the two systems would be more apparent, and therefore better understood. We are now, according to our proposed arrangement, to enter upon this subject, and we ask your attention to a plain examination of it, in the full confidence that you will need no other stimulus to your interest than the recollection, that it is a doctrine on which hangs the whole religious system of more than one hundred millions of the Christian world.

The rule of faith in the Church of Rome, professes, like our own, to be the Word of God, and of course, it includes the Holy Scriptures. But they maintain that, besides the Scriptures, there was an *oral* delivery of divine truth to the Church, which is equally obligatory on every believer; of which *unwritten* Word, the Church is the sole depository, and in the safe preservation of which, as well as in her power of interpreting the written Word, she cannot err, being absolutely infallible.

It is a source of much satisfaction to find the late distinguished advocate of the Church of Rome, Dr. Wiseman, resting the whole of this doctrine on the Scriptures, since thus the quality of the evidence is brought into a much more intelligible compass. The following is his language, and we beg that you will mark it, my brethren, with especial care. (p. 51, Vol. I. Am. ed.) “We believe,” saith he, “that there is no other ground-work whatever for faith, except the written Word of God; because we allow no power in religion to any living authority, except inasmuch as its right to define is conferred in God’s written Word. If, therefore, you hear that the Church claims authority to define articles of faith, and to instruct her children what they must believe, you must not for one moment think that she pretends to any authority or sanction for that power, save what she conceives herself to derive from the clear, express, and explicit words of Scripture. Thus, therefore, it is truly said, that whatever is believed by

us, although not positively expressed in the written Word of God, is believed, because the principle adopted by us is there expressly revealed."

"By the *unwritten* Word of God then," continues Dr. Wiseman, "we mean a body of doctrines, which in consequence of express declarations in the *written* Word, we believe not to have been committed to writing, but delivered by Christ to his apostles, and by the apostles to their successors. We believe that *no new doctrine* can be introduced into the Church, but that *every doctrine* which we hold has existed and been taught in it, ever since the time of the apostles, and was handed down by them to their successors, under the only guarantee on which we receive doctrines from the Church, that is, Christ's promise to abide with it for ever, to assist, direct and instruct it, and always teach in and through it. So that, while giving our explicit credit, and trusting our judgment to it, we are believing and trusting to *the express teaching of Christ himself.*"

Here then we have the plain declaration of this learned and ingenious defender of the Church of Rome, that the Scriptures require us to believe the voice of the Church to be the voice of Christ, the unwritten Word delivered by the Church to be equal to the Scriptures in point of authority, and the infallible truth of the Church to be the same in substance as the infallible truth of the Bible; and therefore the Roman rule of faith includes the Scriptures, together with the decisions of the Church, attributing as much unerring assurance of divine truth to the one, as to the other.

But we are not only indebted to this distinguished writer for the foregoing statement of the Rule of Faith. He gives us also a very candid declaration of the consequences, to any one belonging to his Church, that presumes to doubt it. "For the moment any Roman Catholic doubts," saith he, (p. 65,) "not alone the principles of his faith, but any one of those doctrines

which are thereon based—the moment he allows himself to call in question any of the dogmas which the Church teaches, as having been handed down within her—that moment the Church conceives him to have virtually abandoned all connexion with her. For *she exacts such implicit obedience*, that if any member, however valuable, however he may have devoted his early talents to the illustration of her doctrines, fall away from his belief in *any one* point, he is cut off without reserve; and we have, in our times, seen striking and awful instances of the fact.” We shall have occasion to show you, brethren, in a future discourse, that the effect of this is to place the authority of the Church above the authority of the Bible.

But before we examine the Scriptural proofs relied on for this vast prerogative on behalf of the Church, which will form the subject of our next lecture, we are bound to notice one general argument, by which Dr. Wiseman, and all other writers of the Church of Rome, endeavour to demonstrate the reasonableness and the necessity of such an infallible authority in the Christian system.

And here, they draw their strongest proof from the deplorable fact, that Protestants, professing to make the Bible their rule of faith, are so divided into jarring and discordant sects, that there is no unity amongst them. And therefore they insist upon the experience of the last three hundred years, as affording the clearest evidence of the superior advantages, credit and safety of their rule of faith, since it excludes all the irregular action of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture, and brings all minds to the same infallible standard of decision.

The fact here stated, my beloved brethren, is too glaring to be denied. Awful, shameful, and ruinous to the best interests of Scriptural Christianity, have been the dissensions and strifes

of that portion of Christendom which we call REFORMED. The spiritual despotism of Rome, once broken, has been followed by total licentiousness of opinion, and the sin of schism has lost its terrors, until Christians have imagined that division was a blessing, which fulfilled the double purpose of keeping a wholesome guard upon the encroachments of error, and of indulging the tastes of mankind with a useful variety of religious entertainment.

Seated in conscious security upon the throne of her dominion, the Church of Rome has looked in derision and in scorn at the discordant hosts of Protestant Christians, who, instead of uniting their arms against her errors, have been struggling to beat down one another. And the unbelieving world, the Jew, and the Mahometan, have learned to mock at the whole; taught by Rome that there could be no truth where there was no unity, and taught by the quarrels of Protestants that there was no certainty of the truth to be obtained at all. Respect for the authorized priesthood—the ministry of Christ—has been trodden to the ground: reverence for antiquity has been denounced, as a weak superstition: the discipline and government of the Churches have been delivered up to the influence of wealth and popularity: the very edifices erected for the worship of God have been held ready for the accommodation of any worldly exhibition: and all the solemn characteristics of the high and holy privilege, by which man—sinful and unworthy—is admitted to hold communion with the Majesty of the invisible Creator, through the atonement and righteousness of the divine Redeemer—all the sanctity—all the awe—all the signs of outward humility—all the appendages of outward devotion—have been denounced under the common and undistinguishing cry of Popery and Priestcraft.

The fearful consequences of this sad desecration are beginning to be apparent to the most careless observer, who will but pause to contemplate the present state of the Christian

world. There is a tendency amongst the thoughtful and reflecting, in many quarters, to grow weary and sick of the endless confusion around them, and to look for order and for peace wherever it can be found. The apparent union and venerable antiquity of Rome attract them, and they feel strongly inclined to overlook her corrupt doctrines, for the sake of her magnificent ritual, and her solemn repose. And thus, of late years, converts, as they are called, of learning, of rank, and of much influence, on the continent of Europe, and in England herself, have come forth to prove the power of the temptation, and to show to the jarring communions of Protestants the force of St. Paul's admonition:—"If ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another." (Gal. v. 15.)

The most extraordinary manifestation of this tendency, however, is in the wonderful change exhibited by England within our own time. England, which gave to the principles of the Reformation their most effective support, and their fairest promise of prosperity—England, whose statute books were marked with the strongest lines of antipathy to Rome and hatred to Popery—England, whose apprehensions and precautions seemed to be justified by the martyr-fires which were kindled to sustain the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation—whose queen had been excommunicated by Pope Sixtus V., and her crown attempted to be transferred by his usurped power to the king of Spain, in punishment for her refusal to return under the Papal domination—England, whose established Church was bound to commemorate, by a solemn yearly service, the gunpowder plot, which was alleged to be another work of Popish treason,—whose functionaries of State, in their oaths of office, were obliged to swear that they held the doctrine of Rome to be a damnable idolatry, and whose very sovereigns, in their coronation oath, were bound to vow the maintenance and support of the Protestant religion—this very

England, to the amazement of the Christian world, has admitted the Roman Catholics to her Parliament—opens her treasures to sustain their theological seminaries, priests and bishops—allows the free and complete toleration of their worship—listens to their arguments with growing inclination and favour,—and stands at this hour in such a position, that it is a grave question amongst reflecting minds whether the Church of Rome may not yet regain the complete ascendancy over England herself, before the end of the present generation.

A fair counterpart to this picture is exhibited in the United States; where it is unquestionable that the condition and prospects of the Roman Church are in a course of rapid advancement. Union is their strength, division is the weakness of those that stand opposed to them. And therefore, in their controversy with us about the rule of faith, it is always a prominent and a favourite argument, that they can point so triumphantly to the contrast exhibited in the state of the religious world; and thus, seeming to have the practical proof altogether on their side, they plausibly contend, that the rule which works confusion instead of unity, must be an insufficient rule—that the rule which works harmony and peace, must be the rule which Christ intended for his people.

Brethren, I know, too well, the force of this practical argument; and no words of mine can do justice to the anxiety which I have long felt, that all Christians who hold the blessed Scriptures to be the true rule of faith, would give their minds solemnly and prayerfully to the examination of the only principle which could counteract its influence. This principle I will proceed to explain, so as to show, that the Articles of the Church of England, understood according to their application in her own system, point out the true course, by which the errors of the Church of Rome must be abandoned on the one hand, without any risk of confusion or strife upon the other.

You may remember, that in our last discourse, I set forth

the language of several of those Articles, in which the following propositions were clearly asserted:—

First, that the Holy Scriptures were the true standard of faith.

Secondly, that the Church had authority in controversies of faith, but yet had no power to exert this authority in contrariety to Scripture.

Thirdly, that the Church, whether acting in General Councils or otherwise, was not infallible, but had a right to claim obedience only so far as her decisions were conformable to the written Word of God.

And fourthly, that no man should be allowed to set his private judgment in opposition to the Church, so long as the Church was not plainly in opposition to Scripture.

Now, if you will put these propositions carefully together, you will find them result in this:—that the Scriptures are the rule of faith, and that the Church holds the office of interpreter. Or in other words, the Scriptures lay down the *law* of faith, and the Church is the *judge* to expound the law, and apply it to the cases of individuals. And when we ask what Church shall exercise this power of interpretation, we reply, that although, for the sake of peace and order, the smallest body of Christians, to whom the word Church can be applied, is better than a single man—although the importance of the term Church rises with the magnitude and official responsibility of its character—although, when it reaches the dignity of a national Church, it must be a case of plain contrariety to the Supreme Lawgiver, which would justify any individual in opposing it—yet, in the principles we are considering, there is a still more sublime aspect of the Church which belongs to the subject, namely, the CHURCH CATHOLIC OR UNIVERSAL; such as it was at the time when the epithet *Catholic* became in current use—such as it was at the time when it settled the canon of Scripture—while yet it remained in the comparative

purity of its primitive state, and long before the Church of Rome assumed the title of the "*Mother and Mistress of all the Churches.*" And if you ask me for the chronology of this period, I shall reply, that until A. D. 312, the date assigned for the conversion of the Emperor Constantine, the Church was subject to successive persecutions from the heathen, some of which were dreadfully severe: that the bitter sufferings endured at these times must, under God, have kept Christianity unpolluted and clear of corruption, since all experience shows that chastisement and trial are the friends of faith, while prosperity and power are its worst enemies: that when the Church was lifted up by the favour of the imperial throne, then came her time of worldly ease and of spiritual declension, so that the brightness of her primitive faith began to wane about the middle of the fourth century. And therefore, whenever we can have access to the interpretations, customs, worship, and discipline of the Church Catholic or Universal up to this period, we have the highest and safest authority of judgment, upon the rule of faith exhibited to us in the written Word of God.

You will not understand me, however, as asserting, that even the primitive Church Catholic is to be held infallible, nor that her judgment is to be placed upon an equality with the sacred Scriptures. God forbid! Even amongst men, we distinguish carefully between the authority of the *judge*, and the authority of the *law*. The representative wisdom and power of the whole commonwealth, address us in the language of the legislature; while the office of the judge is ancillary and subordinate. He cannot make the law, nor supply its defects, nor alter its provisions; and yet his office is not the less important on this account; since he is appointed to settle its construction, to declare its true intent, and to pronounce the sentence which its authority sanctions. If every man were at liberty to construe the law of the land for himself, we should

have law enough perhaps, but little justice. Hence it is easy to see, why the judicial office, though quite distinct from the legislative function, and inferior to it, is a necessary part of every system of earthly government. And yet who would be so absurd as to say, that the judges were infallible?

Now the same relation which the judge bears to the law, the Jewish priesthood bore to the law of Christ as it was then established, and the Christian priesthood bears to the whole system of faith, as it is committed to the full records of the Gospel. The authority of the earthly judge controls the private judgment of advocates and suitors in the interpretation of human law, without any idea of his infallibility. Judges may err, and judges have erred; but their errors must be rectified by those that come after them, and do not interfere with the exercise of their official function at the time. So too, the Jewish priests might err, and did err—yea, even to the rejection of the blessed Son of God. Yet this did not hinder our Lord from saying to his disciples, (Mat. xxiii. 2,) “The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat, all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works; for they say, and do not:” so far was the great Redeemer from countenancing any want of respect for the judicial powers which his own Word had established. And in like manner the successors of the apostles might err, and did err; and yet they held the place of the living authority by Christ’s own appointment; and therefore, unless in the case of an open and plain opposition to his Word, the judgment of individuals might not lawfully oppose them.

Thus far, then, my brethren, you perceive, that the principle which adopts the Scriptures as the rule of faith, by no means excludes the idea of official interpretation. On the contrary, this principle rather assumes, that where there is a written rule, there must be a class of authorized interpreters. And therefore it results that the Article which asserts this fundamental

principle is in perfect harmony with the other Article which declares, that "THE CHURCH HATH AUTHORITY IN CONTROVERSIES OF FAITH;" while, nevertheless, just as the earthly judge can only interpret and apply, without presuming to make or to alter the law, so the Church, as the Article expresses it, *may not lawfully ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written*; neither may the Church *so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another*; neither *ought the Church to decree any thing against the Scriptures, nor enforce any thing besides the same to be believed for necessity of salvation*. All which expressions are in the strictest accordance with the proper discharge of the judicial function.

When we come to apply these principles to the case of the Reformation, we shall see a strong and marked distinction in the course of the several reformers, which clearly accounts for the difference in the result. The living, judicial authority of Christ's Church, once CATHOLIC, and if not absolutely, yet reasonably unanimous, ceased to be so in a few centuries after the time of Constantine. The Greek and the Roman Churches separated, in consequence of Roman innovation; and the influence of error, throughout the whole of Europe, increased, until it was time, in the order of divine Providence, to teach the judges of the Church to respect the Bible, and to compel them to abandon that usurped prerogative of *legislating* for the faith, which they had been, for so long a time, unlawfully taking upon them.

In rectifying the evil, Luther went to work in too much confidence of private judgment; Zuinglius did the same; Calvin did the same. Provoked and excited by the usurpations of the Roman priesthood, they did not pause to separate the use from the abuse—the usurpation, from the real judicial authority, committed to the pastors of the Church by Christ himself. Hence they overthrew the whole system of ecclesiastical government, assumed the dangerous principle that the great

Head of the Church had not appointed any specific kind of government for it, and that any form at all was equally acceptable in his sight, so that the Scriptures held their proper rank as the rule of faith to his people. The sad result of this error, my beloved brethren, is the wretched state of strife and dissension to which we have already alluded. Heresy, in its deadliest form, has swept through the Lutheran Churches and the Universities of Germany. The very pulpit of Calvin at Geneva has been long occupied by men, who preach the doctrine for which Calvin condemned Servetus to the stake; and still the disorganizing principle runs throughout the land, that the government of Christ's Church is a thing of indifference, but that, as a matter of high expediency, if there be any government at all, the more modern it is, the better.

Now I beseech you, mark the difference in the mode of conducting the Reformation in England. In the first place, we find, that although it was undertaken by sovereigns, yet they committed it to those who held the official right of judges in the Church of God, by regular succession from the apostles. In the second place, we see that they conducted it in the manner of judges, who, having to correct a series of erroneous decisions, take up the law, and carefully consult the expositions of their predecessors. And in the third place, we find that they paid especial regard to those predecessors who, living nearest to the time when the law was established, were most likely to have understood its true meaning. Amongst these English reformers, therefore, all reverence was yielded to the authority of those precedents, which the judicial authority of the Church had established in the primitive day. They desired to exercise no other judgment but that which had been exercised at the beginning; and they proceeded in the order most consistent with this sacred and solemn design, holding frequent councils, making thorough investigations into the rich though complicated records of antiquity, clearing away, by

slow degrees, the novelties that had been brought in upon the system of truth, and making no changes but those which the written rule of faith and the primitive decisions under it, seemed to require. Hence, no one man gave his name to the English Church: no one man presumed to fashion it after his fancy. Many divines there were—Bishops and eminent clergymen, bearing the regular commission of judges in the house of God—who were united in the mighty undertaking. Many martyrs there were, who sealed the sincerity of their labours in their own blood. But not one amongst them desired to do aught in the pride of his private judgment, nor to inscribe his own name on the restored and purified temple of the Lord of Hosts.

Here, then, is the great difference between the Church of England, on the one hand, and the German, the French, and the Swiss reformers, on the other. They all agreed that the Holy Scriptures were the Rule or Standard of faith; but all, except England, assumed the absurdity, that every man was equally authorized to interpret that rule in his own way: that the same God who had given the written law to his Church amongst the Jews, and along with this written law had solemnly established the priesthood as its only ordinary interpreters, had wholly neglected to provide his far more perfect Church with any officers to exercise the judicial function: so that while care was taken to furnish a rule, no care was taken to secure its administration. On her guard against this vain and perilous hypothesis, and guided by the favouring Providence of God, England pursued the true track of Christian obligation in both particulars; fully asserting the supremacy of the written law of the Lord's Gospel, and as clearly recognizing the ministry appointed to interpret and apply it. The result has signally proved the wisdom of the principle. For while confusion and strife have followed in the train of the first three

reformers, order and unity continue with the Church of England to this day.

And the great difference between the Churches of Rome and of England upon the subject, consists in this. That both admit the appointment, by Christ, of a living authority to interpret and apply his Word in the Church, even to the end of the world. But the Church of England holds this living authority to be confined to the *interpretation of the Scriptures* in points of necessary faith and order, and to be *liable*, besides, *to err*. And hence, it is competent to their successors, holding the same official rank and authority, to compare their decisions with the written Word and with ancient precedent, and rectify the error. Whereas the Church of Rome, besides the priestly offices of rulers and judges in the Church, imagines that another doctrine of the faith was delivered to them in addition to that which is contained in Scripture; and also maintains that their judgments are absolutely *infallible*, and therefore *irreformable*; since it is very plain that where no error can possibly exist, there can be no call for reformation.

You perceive, therefore, my brethren, I trust, the truth of what we advanced in our introductory discourse, that the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, are in some respects midway between the Church of Rome upon the one hand, and many of the sectarian Churches on the other. And I am not a little solicitous that our position might be fairly and fully understood, because I am thoroughly persuaded that it occupies the only ground, on which a hope of general Christian unity amongst all Christians can ever rest.

But as the case now stands, we have at least the comfort of knowing, that the strifes and dissensions of Christendom have not been the offspring of our principles. Reverencing the blessed Bible as the recorded rule of our faith, and paying all

due respect to the primitive Church Catholic, in whose authorized judges we recognize the highest human interpreter, we would lead all men to the same tribunal of judgment, and give to all the same benefits of order, and unity, and peace. We neither desire to invent novelties ourselves, nor to adopt the novelties of others, because we value the security and stability of settled law, far more than the giddy and fluctuating charms of modern fancy. And had the other branches of the Reformation pursued the same principle—had they united themselves together with England on the primitive ground, and avoided all the deplorable schisms and strifes which now distract the ranks called Protestant, I doubt whether the course of the glorious Reformation would have had any check or stay, until every abuse in Christendom had been abolished, and Rome herself had resumed the robe of youthful purity which she wore, when the apostle wrote his thanks to God, that “her faith was spoken of throughout the whole world.”

LECTURE IV.

MATT. xxviii. 18, 19, 20.—And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen.

THERE are few things, my beloved brethren, more difficult in the management of a theological discussion, than to simplify the argument so as to render it at all acceptable to ordinary minds, however intelligent; the majority of whom, most probably, have never reflected upon the subject before. And this difficulty belongs, more especially, to the topic introduced in our last, and continued in the present lecture; namely, the rule of faith; because, in its nature, it is abstruse and uninviting; and it is seldom that we can hope to see so close an application to a series of discourses on a dry and complicated point, as is necessary for those who would become familiar with the whole chain of reasoning and evidence belonging to it.

Under such circumstances, our only reliance must be placed upon the strength of that religious sense of duty, which impels every conscientious mind to search for truth, without regard to the unattractive character of the argument. But should you, my brethren, belong to that privileged, though not numerous class, who prefer instruction to mere entertainment, I

can at least promise that your interest will not lessen as we advance; since I feel perfectly safe in asserting, that the subject of the present, and a few of the ensuing lectures, is the least inviting of the course, although, perhaps, the most important to be fully understood.

You probably recollect, that our last lecture set forth the rule of faith professed in the Church of Rome, according to the statement of Dr. Wiseman, in which he admitted that the Scriptures alone must yield the proof of the infallibility claimed for the doctrines of their Church, by virtue of which infallibility they assert an equal certainty of divine truth in their traditions and in the Bible; the one being, indeed, written, and the other unwritten; but both, as they say, being alike the **WORD OF GOD**. The proofs alleged on behalf of the traditions thus exalted by the Roman doctrine to an equality with Scripture, and the infallibility of their Church, form the topics which we promised to discuss in the ensuing lecture. We proceed, accordingly, to consider the arguments which they advance in favour of tradition, and shall then take up their doctrine of infallibility.

They usually commence their defence of tradition by showing, that the first communications of divine truth were delivered orally to the Patriarchs, beginning with Adam; and that from his time down to the deluge, the same truth could only have been transmitted by tradition from generation to generation. And this is undoubtedly correct; but it should always be added, that the result yields us an awful proof of the insufficiency of tradition alone for the preservation of religion, since the whole race of mankind became utterly corrupt, and was destroyed, in consequence, by a universal deluge, which spared none but Noah and his family. It may be said, indeed, that the knowledge of Noah, at least, was pure; and therefore that his case demonstrates the unalloyed transmission of the patriarchal doctrines through a period of more

than two thousand years; but this inference we utterly deny for a double reason. First, because it cannot be shown that Noah had no other basis for his faith than that of tradition. And, secondly, because the contrary may well be presumed from the brief outline of the sacred history, since it is certain that this eminent patriarch had many particular revelations of the divine will vouchsafed to him, some before the flood, and some after it. It is surely unnecessary for me to prove, that he to whom the Almighty condescends to commit his truth by direct communication, must be quite above the necessity of depending upon human tradition.

The advocates of the Church of Rome resume their argument by telling us, that after the flood, the truth was again handed down from Noah to Abraham in the same way; thus demonstrating again the principle, that the transmission of religious doctrines by oral tradition is agreeable to the will of God. And to this, likewise, we willingly assent, if it be added—as it must be, in accordance with the sacred history—that again, and in the comparatively short period of five hundred years, the posterity of Noah had corrupted their traditionary faith, and had become worshippers of idols: so that the Lord, in mercy to mankind, raised up a new man, Abraham, to be the father of the faithful; and sent him away from his kindred and his home, to be a pilgrim and a stranger in the land of Canaan. Here, then, we behold a second proof of the small dependence to be placed upon tradition.

A little further on, in the record of the Scripture history, we find the sons of Jacob, with Jacob himself, settled in Egypt, where their posterity increase and multiply for another period of four hundred years, the latter portion being passed under a bitter bondage, from which Moses is commissioned to deliver them. And how did their traditionary faith stand during all this time, notwithstanding they had a separate part of the country, called the land of Goshen, assigned to them;

and were in a great measure kept distinct from the Egyptians, as well by the rite of circumcision, as by the antipathy of the Egyptians themselves? Why truly, it had become so corrupted, that even after they were delivered from bondage, by signs and wonders of the most astonishing sublimity and grandeur, they forced Aaron to make them a golden calf, and danced and shouted before the idol. Here, then, we have a third proof of the insecurity of tradition.

But now a new dispensation is ushered in, by the establishment of a written record to be the future depository of religious truth. The Deity himself vouchsafes to exemplify the important principle, which was henceforth to be the safeguard of the faith. He pronounces the words of the decalogue from Mount Sinai, in the hearing of the multitude, and then writes them on two tables of stone. In pursuance of the new decree, Moses records every communication of the divine Word, along with every remarkable circumstance in the wonderful history of Israel, during the forty years spent in the wilderness; and the whole of his five books are laid up in the Ark, to be a memorial for ever.

It is worthy of great observation, my brethren, that the committing the precepts of religion, along with the history of the Creation, the fall, the deluge, and all that had previously taken place from the beginning, to the written record of the Word of God, was simultaneous with the establishment of the priesthood, to be the official interpreters and instructors of the people. Before this, there were priests, and there were revelations from time to time. The revelations were committed to no one form of preservation, and the priesthood was committed to no one class, tribe or family. But now, a new principle is introduced in both respects. The revelations of the Deity are committed to writing by his appointed instrument, and the sacred books, together with the tabernacle, the sacrifices, and the whole order of religion, are committed to a peculiar class

of men, the priesthood; whose office is no longer to be exercised at every man's pleasure, but only according to that order which the voice of the Most High commands. We perceive, therefore, that the authority which established the written Word, and that which established the peculiar priesthood to be its guardians, judges and interpreters, are one and the same, namely, the authority of the Lord God of Israel.

But here we meet with a bold assertion on the part of our learned advocate, Dr. Wiseman, and his brethren of the Church of Rome, that "although in the Mosaic law, we have the characteristics of a written code, and although we have an express injunction to note down whatever was to be taught, yet there is no doubt whatever," saith our author, "that by far the most important doctrines were not committed to writing: that among the Jews there was a train of sacred tradition, containing within itself more vital dogmas than are written in the inspired volume."—"The few," continues Dr. Wiseman, "who take the requisite pains to trace the doctrine of the Jews in this regard, will find, that from the very beginning, from the delivery of the law to Moses, there was a great mass of precepts, not written, but committed to the keeping of the priesthood, and by them gradually communicated or diffused among the people, but yet hardly alluded to in the writings of the Sacred Books." This statement, it must be confessed, is somewhat startling; and since the learned advocate of tradition undertakes to give examples in proof of its truth, we are bound in justice to examine them.

His first reference is to the work of the celebrated Warburton, who, in his learned treatise called "The Divine Legislation," maintained that there was no sufficient evidence in the books of Moses, or of the earlier Jews, either of the soul's immortality, or of a future state. Now it is very true that Warburton maintained this notion, and it is equally true, as Dr. Wiseman takes care to inform his readers, that Warbur-

ton was a bishop of the Church of England; but he forgot to add, that the hypothesis of the bishop was universally disowned, that it was censured by his brethren at the time, and has ever since been regarded, in his own Church, as one of those wild and dangerous fancies, which intellectual men are sometimes permitted to indulge, in order perhaps to show how little confidence can be reposed in human genius, when it becomes an admirer of its own powers.

Our author, after laying the foundation of his argument in the exploded notion of Warburton, proceeds to state, what no one will deny, that the Pharisees in our Saviour's days, believed these doctrines of the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body; and hence he draws the strange conclusion, that neither of these doctrines are recorded in the Old Testament Scriptures, having only been handed down by tradition delivered to the Priesthood. But had Dr. Wiseman forgotten the speech of the prophet Balaam, "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his?" Or the declaration of King David, "As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so longeth my soul after thee, O God."—"When I awake up after thy likeness, I shall be satisfied." Or the prophet Isaiah, (xxvi. 19) where he expressly saith, "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust, for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead?" Had he forgotten that most remarkable vision of the valley of dry bones, recorded in the prophecy of Ezekiel, (ch. xxxvii.) where we read: "Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel?" Or the prophecy of Daniel, (ch. xii. 2) declaring, "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and

they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever?" Surely some strange hallucination must be upon the minds of such reasoners, as would endeavour, with passages like these before their eyes, to deny that the doctrine of a future immortality is contained in the Old Testament. But still more does it astonish us to see them distorting the testimony of our blessed Lord himself, when he showed the Sadducees their error with regard to the resurrection; (Mat. xxii. 29, &c.) "Ye do err," saith the divine Teacher, "not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God." Nothing can be more hostile to Dr. Wiseman's theory than this; for the Sadducees could not err by not knowing the Scriptures, in regard to a doctrine which was not contained in Scripture, but only handed down by tradition. "But as touching the resurrection of the dead," continues our blessed Redeemer, "have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead but of the living." Here then is the most direct appeal for this very doctrine to the books of Moses, by Jesus Christ himself; and yet the advocates of Roman tradition would persuade us that the doctrine cannot be found there!

The next example of a reference to oral tradition, as Dr. Wiseman chooses to call it, occurs in the 24th Chapter of the Gospel according to St. Luke. "Our Saviour," saith this author, (p. 62) "tells us that Moses bore testimony of him; and in conversing with his two disciples on the road to Emmaus, quoted the authority of Moses for the necessity of his suffering, and so entering into his glory. And yet you will in vain search the books of Moses to discover this important dogma of the necessity of the Messiah's dying to redeem his people. Where then," asks Dr. Wiseman, "had these points been preserved, save in the traditions of the Jews?"

Now here is truly a strange mystification of the testimony

of Scripture. The passage itself is as follows, and I quote it in full; in order to show a specimen of the kind of argument which, I am sorry to say, occurs but too frequently amongst writers on the Roman side of this question.

“O fools,” said our Lord to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, (Lu. xxiv. 25) “and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself.”

Mark here, my brethren, I beseech you, a threefold error on the part of the Roman advocate. For, in the first place, Dr. Wiseman confines our Lord’s quotation to the books of Moses, whereas St. Luke saith, that the Saviour referred to *all* the prophets, “and beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself.”

Secondly, Dr. Wiseman asserts, that we should in vain search the books of Moses to discover the important dogma of the necessity of the Messiah’s dying to redeem his people. Whereas, to say nothing of the first promise of the Seed of the woman, nor of the representation of the mystery of redemption under the command given to Abraham to slay his only son, it is certain that St. Paul, in his epistle to the Hebrews, argues the whole subject of the atonement from the priesthood of Melchisedec, the tabernacle service, the office of the high priest, and the great principle of the Levitical law, that *without shedding of blood* there could be no remission of iniquity, while yet it was evident that the *blood of bulls and goats could never take away sins*. So that even if our Lord, in illustrating the subject to the disciples on the road to Emmaus, had confined himself to the books of Moses, it would be perfectly erroneous to say, that the doctrine of Christ’s death for his people could not be found there, in the most expressive types and allegories.

And thirdly, Dr. Wiseman asks the question, as if in triumph, "Where had these points been preserved, save in the traditions of the Jews?" whereas St. Luke expressly declares, that our Saviour, beginning at Moses and all the prophets, expounded unto them *in all the Scriptures*, the things concerning himself. I must honestly confess my astonishment at this palpable misrepresentation; for it is plainly impossible that our Lord's expounding to his disciples *in all the Scriptures* the things concerning himself, should mean, that he explained what was not in the Scriptures at all, but only in the doctrines of tradition!

There is yet one instance more, however, which our learned advocate brings forward as a proof in behalf of his favourite tradition. The passage is as follows: "When our Saviour," saith he, (ib.) "proposed to Nicodemus the doctrine of a spiritual birth, and he truly or affectedly understood it not, he reprov'd him in these words: Art thou a Master in Israel, and knowest not these things? What does this rebuke imply," continues Dr. Wiseman, "but that a teacher among the Jews ought to have been acquainted with this important doctrine, from his very office as a teacher? Yet tell me where it is ever taught in the old law, or whence could he have possessed it, except among the traditional lore preserved among the priests and learned?"

Now truly this is marvellous, for the doctrine of this very birth of water and the Spirit is set forth with more or less plainness in many parts of the Old Testament. Let the prophecy of Ezekiel suffice; (xxxvi. 25, &c.) "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, (saith the Lord) and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes,

and ye shall keep my judgments and do them." Here we have all the elements of Christian regeneration in the clearest terms. The sprinkling with clean water, the cleansing from sin, the giving a new heart and a new spirit, the putting the Holy Spirit of God within us, so that the old nature, called the heart of stone, shall be changed into the new nature, called the heart of flesh, and our will shall thenceforth be to keep the ways of the Lord,—what more just and comprehensive statement of the doctrine held forth to Nicodemus could be devised, than is contained in this passage of the prophet, with which every master in Israel was bound to be familiar? It seems, however, that we have to this day masters in Israel, that cannot find the doctrine in the Old Testament any more than Nicodemus, and therefore would have us believe that it was taught by tradition. And yet I do not see how that would lessen their difficulty, since it is plain that Nicodemus knew as little of this imaginary tradition, as he did of the Scripture itself.

Having thus disposed of the cases cited by Dr. Wiseman, let us turn to a part of our blessed Redeemer's instructions, in which he *does* refer to the Jewish traditions plainly; but not in a manner which is at all reconcilable to the Roman hypothesis. The whole narrative is in the 7th Chapter of St. Mark's Gospel, and I shall quote it in full.

“Then came together unto him the Pharisees, and certain of the Scribes which came from Jerusalem. And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled, that is to say, with unwashen hands, they found fault. For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not; holding the tradition of the elders. And when they come from the market, except they wash, they eat not. And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables. Then the Pharisees and Scribes asked him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with un-

washen hands? He answered and said unto them, Well hath Esaias prophesied of you, hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do. And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition. For Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother, and whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death: But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, It is Corban, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me, he shall be free. And ye suffer him no more to do aught for his father or his mother; making the Word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye."

Now hère, as well as in many other places of the Gospels, where the traditions of the Jews are spoken of by our Lord, it is with strong reprehension; clearly proving to us, that even after they had the written standard of divine truth established before them, there was the same tendency of the human heart to corrupt the Word of God, and substitute in its stead, the weak and delusive maxims of the natural understanding. But nowhere does the Saviour mention their traditions with approbation; nowhere does he intimate, that there was any doctrinal truth delivered by Moses to the priesthood, distinct from the written Word of God: and therefore we cannot hesitate to say, that the whole of the hypothesis framed by the advocates of the Church of Rome, in order to sustain the coordinate authority of their traditions, appears thus far totally unsupported by any thing that we can recognize, as worthy of the slightest respect or consideration.

2. We have now, brethren, examined the subject of tradi-

tion, as it is presented in the sacred history up to the period of our Lord's offering himself for his Church; where we must leave it for the present, although it will recur, under another form, in a subsequent lecture.

We come next to consider the main question, on which all the rest depend, namely, the doctrine of the Church's infallibility. For you must bear it in mind, that the principal reliance of the Church of Rome is on this assumption. If Scripture proves that the Church is infallible, then it is of small importance whether the particular traditions which she teaches be found in Scripture or not, because this attribute of infallibility cures all other defects, and makes the authority of the Church equal to the authority of Scripture. Now the passage which Dr. Wiseman and his brethren consider conclusive on this point, is the same which we have selected for our text, being the address made by our blessed Lord to his apostles after his resurrection, and just before his ascension into heaven, as recorded at the close of St. Matthew's Gospel: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo, I *am with you always, even unto the end of the world.*" "Here," according to our author, (p. 83,) "a promise is clearly given by our blessed Redeemer, that he would assist his Church even to the end of time, so as to prevent the possibility of her falling into error, or allowing any admixture thereof with the truths committed to her charge."

We have no dispute with the Church of Rome upon the question, whether this promise was designed to embrace the successors of the apostles to the end of time; for such we think is its fair and obvious meaning. Neither have we any hesitation in saying, that it is a most precious security for the general success, the perpetuity, and final victory of the Church

over every opponent. But we utterly deny that it pledges to the Church an absolute infallibility, or perfect freedom from error. This is the fundamental question of the controversy, by the decision of which the whole doctrine of the Church of Rome, so far as it varies from or adds to the doctrine of Scripture, must stand or fall. The text asserts that Christ will be present with his Church; that is undeniable. The inquiry then must be, whether this presence of Christ was designed to warrant the Church's infallibility. The negative, we think, will be clearly proved, if we consider the import of the promise according to the light of Scripture; and this we shall endeavour to do in four different aspects; first, with regard to individuals; secondly, with regard to ancient Israel; thirdly, with regard to the apostles; and fourthly, with regard to the Christian Churches even of the apostolic day.

And here, I am happy to assert the concurrence of Dr. Wiseman himself, in the only sound principle of interpretation. "On examining the practice of Scripture," saith he, (p. 87,) "we find that wherever God gives a commission of peculiar difficulty, and one which, to those that receive it, appears almost, or indeed entirely beyond the power of man, the way in which he assures them that it can and will be fulfilled, is by adding to the end of the commission, *I will be with you*. As if he should thereby say, The success of your commission is quite secure, because I will give my special assistance for its perfect fulfilment." Now if we apply this principle of Dr. Wiseman's own stating to the various instances in which such a promise occurs, we shall be satisfied, that in none of them does it involve a security against error, or a teaching and believing only what is infallibly true.

First then, as to the cases of individuals, we meet with many examples of this promise. Thus, (Exod. iii. 12) when Moses, alarmed at the difficulty of the enterprise which he was commanded to undertake, saith unto God, "Who am I, that I

should go unto Pharaoh, and that I should bring forth the children of Israel out of Egypt :” the answer is, “Certainly *I will be with thee.*” And again, (Exod. iv. 15) we read that the Lord said to him, “Is not Aaron the Levite thy brother? I know that he can speak well. And also he cometh forth to meet thee. And *I will be with thy mouth and with his mouth*, and will teach you what ye shall do.” Here we have an express promise of the presence of God with Moses and Aaron, and with their mouths to teach them. And yet, who ever supposed that this made them incapable of speaking or of acting erroneously? Substantially and completely was the promise of the Lord fulfilled, for he was with them, and with their mouth, and spake through them to his people Israel. But he had not promised that they should never be permitted to speak *their own words*, and indulge their own infirmities; and therefore we find Moses often murmuring and complaining, and carrying his unadvised language so far, on one occasion, that the Lord would not allow him to enter the promised land, as a memorial of his sin. So Aaron not only yielded to the idolatrous folly of the people in making the golden calf, but afterwards united with Miriam in assaulting the authority of his brother. Plainly, therefore, the promise of God to be with these two most eminent men, and with their mouth to teach them, was not intended to confer upon them any infallible preservative from error, either in speech or in conduct. It only applied to those occasions in which they were the appointed organs of God; speaking the immediate revelations of his word, and acting by his direct and express authority.

We find another, and an inestimable promise of God’s presence, made to the individual believer, where St. Paul, (Heb. xiii. 5) saith, “Let your conversation be without covetousness, and be content with such things as ye have; for he hath said, *I will never leave thee nor forsake thee:* so that we may boldly say, The Lord is my helper, and I will not fear what man

shall do unto me." But nothing of this description can exceed the beautiful language of Christ himself, in St. John's Gospel; (ch. xvii. 20, 21) where he saith, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word. That they may all be one: *as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.*—I IN THEM, AND THOU IN ME, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me." No promise of the divine presence can be more express than this, yet who ever supposed that it conferred infallibility on every individual believer?

In the second place, we are to consider the operation of the presence of God in the case of ancient Israel. Thus, in the book of Genesis, the patriarch Jacob on his death bed saith, (ch. xlviii. 21) "Behold I die, but *GOD shall be with you.*" Again, in the Book of Exodus, in reference to the establishment of the tabernacle, the Almighty saith, (ch. xxix. 45) "I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God." Again, in Leviticus, (xxvi. 44) the Lord saith, "I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them to destroy them utterly and to break my covenant with them, for I am the Lord their God." Again, in Deuteronomy, (ch. iv. 31.) "The Lord thy God is a merciful God, he will not forsake thee." And again, in the prophecy of Isaiah, (ch. xli. 8. 10) "Thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend. Fear thou not, for *I am with thee*; be not dismayed, for I am thy God: I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness." Now it is impossible to imagine stronger language than this, to assure Israel of the divine presence. Nay, they had the visible manifestation of the fact, in the pillar of the cloud and of the fire, and in the glory, or *SHECHINAH*, which filled the most holy place of their taberna-

cle, and afterwards the corresponding part of Solomon's temple. Besides which, the priesthood had the power of consulting God, and obtaining direct answers to any question of high importance to their Church or nation; and yet, who believes that they were infallible? The successors of that priesthood were the men whom the Redeemer charged with making void the law of God by their traditions. Yea, the same high-priest, who was enabled to utter a prophecy concerning the death of Christ, (Jo. xi. 49) is also recorded to have charged our blessed Saviour with blasphemy, because he called himself the Son of God. Clearly then, the divine presence, glorious as the privilege was, conferred no infallibility on Israel.

3. We have, in the third place, to consider the effect of the presence of Christ in the case of the apostles. And here it is obvious to remark, that our Lord was actually and bodily with them, for several years. They were his chosen companions by night and by day. He gave them power over unclean spirits and to heal diseases. He sent them forth to preach the kingdom of God; he taught them, and called them his friends and brethren; but did this, his gracious presence, and favour, and instruction, make them infallible? So far from it, that we find them disputing who should be the greatest; for which they were reprov'd. Again, they rebuke those that brought the infants, whereat their blessed Master was "much displeas'd." Again, they ask, whether they should call down fire from heaven to consume those who refused to give them hospitality on the way to Jerusalem, and their Lord replies, "ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of." Again, they desire to forbid one that cast out devils in their Master's name, because he followed not with them; on which occasion Christ said, "forbid him not." Lastly, they all forsake him in the night wherein he was betray'd, and Peter denies him before morning. These facts show us, distinctly, that even in the case of the apostles, the presence of Christ was not intended to confer

infallibility. And the argument stands thus: the Saviour passed three years with his apostles during his earthly ministry; and after his resurrection, and before his ascension, he promised to be with them always, even to the end of the world. But if his being with them, during the first, did not make them infallible, his being with them during the second, does not make them infallible; so that we have here the clearest demonstration, that whatever infallibility we allow to the instructions of the apostles, was not the result, simply, of the *presence* of their Lord, but belonged to a totally distinct matter, viz: the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them on the day of Pentecost, according to the tenor of the Saviour's command; "Tarry in Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." It was this inspiration that stamped infallibility upon the doctrines of the apostles, so that their writings are received as the Word of God, and not the word of men. But this has no relation to the promise of the text. Inspiration is one thing, and the presence of Christ is another.

Lastly, we were to consider the fact, that the Churches of Christ, even during the apostolic day, were not infallible; and this we learn with the clearest evidence, from the Book of Revelation. There we behold the glorious Redeemer represented as walking in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks, which are the seven Churches of Asia, presided over by their respective angels or bishops. And the apostle John receives the command to write to each, a solemn message of admonition. From these I shall proceed to make a few quotations. "To the angel of the Church of Ephesus write; These things saith he, that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand, who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks. I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them that are evil; and thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars. Nevertheless I have somewhat against thee, because

thou hast left thy first love. Remember, therefore, from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent.”

“And to the angel of the Church in Pergamos write; These things saith he, which hath the sharp sword with two edges: I know thy works and where thou dwellest, even where Satan’s seat is; and thou holdest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith. . . . But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balac to cast a stumbling block before the children of Israel. So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate. Repent, or else I will come unto thee quickly, and fight against them with the sword of my mouth.”

“And unto the angel of the Church in Thyatira, write; These things saith the Son of God, I know thy works, and charity, and service, and faith, and thy patience, and thy works. Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols. But unto you I say, and unto the rest in Thyatira, as many as have not this doctrine, and which have not known the depths of Satan as they speak, I will put upon you none other burden. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches.”

The greater part of these solemn addresses, brethren, are in a similar strain; all shewing, that although the Lord was present with them, walking in the midst of these Churches, yet more or less error, some practical, some doctrinal,—yea, the depths of Satan,—were found amongst them; a plain evidence that his presence with his Church in this imperfect state did not confer infallibility. We shall have occasion, in a future

discourse, to show you many more awful proofs of the same truth, when we come to examine the history of the Councils, and the claims of papal supremacy. But so far as we have gone, and judging on Scriptural grounds, nothing seems necessary to be added to the proof, that the language of the text yields no support to the Roman doctrine.

Having thus, as I trust, established the negative, I shall detain you but a few moments in showing the positive sense of the promise, that Christ would be with the apostles and their successors to the end of the world. And here, we have only to apply the rule of interpretation furnished by Dr. Wiseman himself. "Wherever," saith he, "God gives a commission of peculiar difficulty, and one which to those that receive it appears almost, or indeed entirely, beyond the power of man, the way in which he assures them that it will be fulfilled, is by adding to the end of the commission, I will be with you." Now this furnishes the simple key to the meaning of the promise in the text. Christ was with the apostles, in the power of the Holy Ghost, with signs, and miracles, and supernatural strength, and the truth which flows from immediate inspiration. Of these, miracles and signs were necessary to the fulfilment of their peculiar part of the commission, to plant the Gospel in the face of persecution, and danger, and death; and inspiration was necessary to enable them to complete the written record of the Word of God, to be a standard of faith to all future ages. And Christ has been with their successors ever since, though not with tongues, nor in miracles, nor in inspiration, but in the secret succours of his grace, and the guiding hand of his providence, carrying forward the mighty purposes of his divine mission, in despite of all opposition, and in the midst of every difficulty, to the day of the final victory. Nor is the gracious assurance confined to the apostles and their successors. For Christ is as truly present at this moment with every heart, which humbly and faithfully seeks to know

and serve him; he will never leave them or forsake them; he will accomplish all his merciful designs in them on earth, and he will bring them at last to his heritage of glory. But all this is a very different thing from the infallibility of the Church of Rome, which Christ never promised, and therefore could not be expected to bestow. He did not say that his Church should never err in doctrine, but on the contrary warns and admonishes them, lest they should fall into error. We may not trespass upon you, however, by entering now upon this branch of the argument, but shall reserve it, along with the other texts alleged by our Roman brethren, for the next lecture.

But we may not conclude, without an expression of devout gratitude to God, that the presence of Christ is promised and granted, where there is no claim to infallibility. For if it were otherwise, my beloved brethren, what hope could we cherish of the presence of the Saviour with any soul? If our compassionate Redeemer dwells with no intellect that is fallible—in no heart that is not liable to err—where could be his abode amongst us? Alas! nowhere. Nay, on such a theory, the presence of God might be denied even to the celestial hierarchy; for we know from the express authority of his own Word, that the very heavens are not clean in his sight, and that he chargeth his angels with folly before him.

Be ours, then, the humble and the watchful spirit, which becomes those who are exhorted to work out their salvation with fear and trembling. Let us respect the judgment of the primitive saints who followed next in the track of the apostles, but let us allow of no infallibility except what flows from direct inspiration, and is alone recorded in the written Word of the unerring, the omniscient, the eternal God. And thus, my beloved brethren, even while following the course of a perplexed and tedious controversy, we shall be enabled to shun the folly of dogmatism, and the pride of opinion. With the love of truth for our motive, with the Holy Scripture for our guide,

with the temper of charity for our constant companion—may each successive step of our investigation serve to strengthen our convictions, to increase our thankfulness, and to give fervour to our prayers, that all who profess and call themselves Christians may hold the faith, in the unity of the Spirit, and the bond of peace.

LECTURE V.

2 THESS. ii. 15.—Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle.

YOU are invited once more, beloved brethren, to resume the examination of the principles of that Church, which claims to herself the prerogative of infallibility, and places her traditions upon an equality with the blessed Word of God. We have seen, already, some specimens of the skill and subtilty, with which her advocates defend her pretensions; and we shall have abundant occasion to admire their ingenuity, while we lament its misapplication, before our labours are closed. Regarding the Church of Rome, as I regard every Church in Christendom, with kindness and esteem for the Redeemer's sake, and anxiously desirous to conduct even the work of controversy so as to subserve the great cause of Christian unity and peace, I have no wish to keep back any portion of their arguments, but rather a disposition to place them all in their strongest light, because in no other way could I do them justice—in no other way could I bring each several question fairly up to the standard of truth—in no other way could I hope to be of any real service in the warfare against error—and above all—in no other way could I pursue my humble undertaking in the fear of God, or obtain for it the guidance and safeguard of his blessing. 1

But in addition to these conclusive reasons for the mode in which I have resolved to treat this important controversy, I

rejoice in the conviction, that in no other way could I promise myself the desired measure of success. And I hail it as a sign of an improving spirit in our age, when calm and temperate and thorough examination of the most abstruse and uninviting points of theological discussion, is more welcome to the minds of all discerning and reflecting men, than bitter invective, exaggerated misstatements, or noisy and tumid declamation.

Our last lecture was occupied, as you will probably recollect, by the proofs alleged on the part of the distinguished Roman Catholic, Dr. Wiseman, in favour of their fundamental doctrine of the rule of faith, which asserts not only the authority of the Scriptures, as the *written* Word, but also the equal authority of their traditions, as being the *unwritten* Word of God, handed down from the apostles themselves, through the infallible instrumentality of the Church. We considered, at large, the evidence which the Scriptures furnished on the insecurity of all tradition, up to the days of our blessed Redeemer. We examined fully the import of the text, in which He promises to be with his apostles and their successors to the end of the world; and we showed how inconsistent it was with the whole tenor of the Word of God, that the presence of Christ should be interpreted as being a warrant for the Church's infallibility. The further discussion of the Roman claim was reserved for the following lecture; in which we hope, by the aid of Him, who is the way, the truth and the life, to dispose of the remaining arguments adduced upon this subject.

The first statement which meets us, in this part of the discussion, is calculated to make considerable impression on an incautious mind. It is briefly, as follows: that our Saviour sent forth his apostles with *authority*; "AS MY FATHER HATH SENT ME, SO SEND I YOU:" that they accordingly preached the Gospel with all authority: that they required assent to the things which they spake, without referring their hearers to the Scriptures; nay, that when they preached to the Gentiles,

they did not even intimate that there was such a Book: that instead of this, they ordained ministers wherever they went, and commanded the people to listen and to obey them that had the rule over them, saying every where, as to the Thessalonians in the text—"Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the *traditions* which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle." To this our learned advocate adds the language of the apostle to Timothy, (2 Tim. i. 13) "Hold fast the *form of sound words* which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us;" in which passage, it is plain that there is something else alluded to, besides the Scriptures. In another place, the same eminent apostle saith to Timothy, "The things which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, commit thou to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also." "Here then," to use the words of Dr. Wiseman, "St. Paul does not say, 'Treasure up this my epistle as a part of God's holy Word, and give copies of it to those whom you have to instruct;' and this surely would have been the safest way of preserving the doctrines he had delivered; but he tells Timothy to choose faithful or trustworthy men, and to confide the doctrines he had received to their hands, that they, in turn, might communicate them to others. Is not this," saith Dr. Wiseman, "clearly assuming oral teaching as the method to be established and pursued by the Church of Christ?"

Now in all this, my brethren, there is much that we cheerfully acknowledge; but it is so ingeniously applied to a most mistaken inference, that it will take us some time and attention to disentangle the truth from the accompanying error.

It is true that the apostles were sent forth with authority to teach; and that their teaching, as we are assured, was "with the demonstration of the Spirit, and with power." From the time when the Holy Ghost descended upon them on the day

of Pentecost, they had the infallible authority of inspiration, together with the visible seal of heaven to that authority, in the working of miracles, casting out devils, healing the sick, conferring supernatural powers such as the gift of tongues, raising the dead, and thus exhibiting what St. Paul, in his epistle to the Corinthians, calls "the signs of an apostle."

It is true likewise, that the apostles ordained men to be their successors, in preaching the Gospel and governing the Churches when they should be no more; but the Church of Rome herself does not pretend that these successors of the apostles were intended to possess either their inspiration, or their miraculous powers, or their ability to confer supernatural powers on others. I do not indeed forget, in making this assertion, that the Church of Rome claims the continuance of miracles within her communion, and tells a prodigious number of wonderful things about particular saints, which every man is at liberty either to believe or not, just as he may think proper. But this is altogether wide of the present subject, because they have never advanced the idea, that the successors of the apostles, *as such*, received the communication of the powers which we have enumerated. Every bishop in the Universal or Catholic Church, for instance, is a successor to the office of the apostles, in the authority to teach, to ordain, and to govern. Such, precisely, were Timothy and Titus. But the Church of Rome has not yet maintained the absurdity that her bishops, archbishops, or even the pope himself, succeeded to the apostolic powers of inspiration, miracles, and the supernatural faculty of imparting the gift of tongues to others by the imposition of their hands. Of course, then, they cannot deny that the preaching and teaching of the apostles stood upon an independent basis, peculiar to themselves; and, in the nature of the case, totally inapplicable to those who should come after them.

It was perhaps in this very respect, that the Saviour's ad-

dress to his apostles may best be understood, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." For as he appealed to his wonderful works, in proof of his divine character and mission, saying "Believe me for the very works' sake," (John xiv. 11) so he promised to his apostles the same kind of attestation, (ib. 12 v.) "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the *works that I do shall he do also.*" Hence the apostles were entitled to an implicit acquiescence, on a peculiar ground, which none that came after them could rightly pretend to occupy; and hence we may distinctly see, that their personal authority and that of the Church are of a very different description. To prove the oral teaching of the apostles, there were inspiration and miracles; consequently, whatever the Thessalonians or Timothy heard them *say*, was to be believed with as much reverence as what they received in writing; and the assent of the mind in both cases was to be of that absolute sort, which is called, in the language of theology, **IMPLICIT FAITH**. But to prove the oral teaching of the apostles' successors, or the Church, there is neither inspiration nor miracles, and therefore the Church is bound to refer all she teaches to the authority of the apostles. For as in the case of the apostles, the doctrine of God, and the authority of God went together, so in the case of the Church, the authority of the apostles, and the doctrine of the apostles must go together. Surely, then, it must be plain, that the grounds on which we assert the apostles' infallibility, are in no respect applicable to their successors. That the traditions delivered by the apostles themselves, whether by word or by their epistles, were infallible, we freely grant; because the power of miracles and inspiration proved their infallibility; but that the Church is infallible in handing down to us that apostolical tradition, is a totally different matter.

This might be a sufficient answer to the argument on the other side; but we should do great injustice to the subject if

we failed to take notice of two other modes of understanding the passages on which the Roman argument is supported, which, to some minds, may be more satisfactory.

Let it then be noted, in the second place, that at the time when St. Paul wrote his epistles, the New Testament, as we now possess it, was not in existence. The Old Testament indeed was in the hands of the Jews, and by means of the Septuagint version into Greek, was made accessible to the Gentiles. But the New Testament was not recorded at all, except in scattered parts, some of the most important of which, namely the Gospel of St. John and the Book of Revelation, were certainly not written, until after St. Paul's martyrdom; and it is altogether doubtful whether any of the other three Gospels were in being, at the time when he wrote the language of the text. In the very necessity of the case, therefore, the whole of what we now have from the pen of inspiration, viz: the generation, the life, the doctrine, the sufferings, the miracles, the death, resurrection and ascension of our Lord and Saviour,—all, in a word, that forms the four Gospels, must have been first delivered *orally* by the apostles, as the Word of God; just as the communications of the Lord to Moses were received by the Israelites, before the Scriptures of the Old Testament were recorded. But these communications to Moses, being afterwards committed to writing for the purpose of safe transmission, we find the prophets and apostles, and especially Christ himself, always appealing to *the Scriptures*, and never to the oral tradition which preceded the Scriptures, when a question arose as to what God had said by the mouth of Moses. And precisely in like manner should we appeal to the Scriptures of the New Testament, for the record of those things which the apostles delivered orally; since it is evident that we occupy the same relation to the New Testament, that the Jewish Church in our Saviour's days occupied with regard to the Old

Testament, and the Scriptures of the one must be presumed to be as complete and infallible a guide, as those of the other.

In the third place, however, it must be remembered, that our rule of faith does not exclude tradition, in those things which belong to *interpretation*, or *form*, or *discipline*; and if St. Paul is understood to speak of these in the text addressed to the Thessalonians, as he certainly did in the text addressed to Timothy, there would be no room for controversy remaining. For I have been careful to state, that while we look only to the Scriptures in all points which belong to FAITH, and likewise in all points which involve the PRINCIPLES even of forms and discipline; yet we regard with reverence the testimony of tradition, in questions of interpretation, as well as in matters of practical detail. And here, I shall probably be more intelligible if I recur to the doctrine of our third lecture, where I argued from the familiar analogy of worldly things in the case of the judges and the law. The rule of faith which we acknowledge, is the law of the Gospel dispensation, recorded in the Scriptures, which, like every other work of its great Author, we believe to be sufficiently comprehensive and complete, to answer all the purposes of salvation for which it was given. Now surely it is inconceivable that an earthly legislature could commit such a pre-eminent absurdity, as to put forth a system of law, of which *part* should be recorded in WRITING, and *another equally important part* should only be delivered ORALLY TO THE JUDGES, to be by them handed down to those who should come after them, in the same loose and uncertain way. And we think it still more inconceivable, that the All-wise Lawgiver of the Church should have furnished his rule of saving faith and obedience in such a shape, that only part of it was committed to the *written* record, while the equally or still more important part, was to be entrusted by *oral tradition* to the judges of the Church, who should succeed the apostles, as the interpreters and administrators of the system, for all

time to come. Here is a dilemma out of which the ingenuity of the Church of Rome has never been able to extricate them. They admit, with us and the whole Christian world, that the Scriptures were written by the express inspiration of God. But if tradition is as safe and as infallible a repository for divine truth as Scripture, why were the Scriptures written at all? Why was not the whole of that truth left to the sole custody of tradition? On the other hand, if tradition is not as safe and as infallible a repository for divine truth as Scripture, why was only a part of that truth committed to Scripture, and the rest left to the more uncertain mode of preservation? For manifest it is, that no reason can ever be assigned why part of the rule or law of faith should have been written, which will not necessarily include the whole.

But in the administration of earthly law, though the legislature leaves no part of the law unrecorded, yet the interpretation of the law is committed to the judges, and passes down from court to court, making a rule of *judicial tradition*, which is not indeed considered as *infallible*, nor ever confounded with the *law itself*, but is yet regarded with high respect, and never departed from without the strongest evidence of error. And besides this office of interpretation, there are the various forms of law, and the rules of pleading, comprising very many points of practice necessary to the order of judicial proceedings, in which the judges are left free to adopt their own ideas of propriety, in the first place; but which, when once established, constitute the rules of Court; and thus become another branch of judicial tradition, handed down from age to age with much regard, and although liable to alteration, yet never altered without great cause, and on weighty and sufficient reasons.

Now here we have a simple illustration of what we understand to be the office of the SCRIPTURE and the office of *tradition*. The Scripture contains the perfect, unerring, and divine *law or rule of faith*, committed to the judges and officers

of the Church, for their administration. The apostles, as the *lawgivers* of the Church, to whom was entrusted the most difficult part of the great work which was to establish the government or kingdom of heaven amongst men, were endowed with inspiration, and were therefore infallible. And as being the first *judges*, they laid down the rules of Scriptural interpretation, the forms of worship, the modes of discipline, the manner of administering the sacraments, with many other details, which make, indeed, no part of the rule of faith itself, but which are indispensable to its proper and orderly operation, in the hands of those who were appointed to succeed them in the government of the Church of God. Hence, therefore, when we read the charge of St. Paul to the Thessalonians in the text, to hold fast the *traditions* which they had learned of him, whether by word or by his epistle, we are under no necessity of supposing him to allude to any doctrine which formed a part of the great rule or law of faith, and which might be readily collected in writing even from his own epistles; but only to those points of Church order and discipline, for which we find him making a temporary arrangement in his epistle to the Corinthians. And in like manner, when he charges Timothy to hold fast the form of sound words which he had heard, we understand him to mean, not as the Church of Rome would fain persuade us, some of her *doctrines* of purgatory, or invocation of saints, or transubstantiation, but those *forms* of worship, the creed, and the liturgy, which we find to have been adopted by all the primitive Churches, and which have descended in their more important parts even to our own day. We see, then, that the language of the text yields no support to the Roman traditions, first, because the authority of inspiration was confined to the apostles; secondly, because the very rule of faith itself was of necessity delivered orally, before the Gospels were written; and thirdly, because the

words of St. Paul may be as fairly applied to points of order or practice, as to points of faith.

The next argument of Dr. Wiseman will not need more than a very brief examination. He refers to a custom which seems, for a time, to have existed in some parts of the primitive Church, called by theologians *the discipline of the secret*, according to which it appears, that candidates for admission into the Church were kept in ignorance of the more important doctrines of the faith, until after Baptism. And he quotes a passage from the works of Rev. Mr. Newman, of the Church of England, to show, that although the Scriptures were open to every one who chose to consult them, yet, in point of fact, "the fully developed doctrines of the Trinity and the incarnation, and still more, the doctrine of the atonement as once made upon the cross, and commemorated and appropriated in the Eucharist, were not learned from Scripture, but from the Church." "From the very first," saith Mr. Newman, "the rule has been for the Church to teach the truth, and then appeal to the Scripture in vindication of its own teaching." Strangely enough, according to my poor judgment, Dr. Wiseman conceives that this statement warrants his doctrine of tradition and infallibility, whereas nothing can be farther from the mark. For it is evident that the Scriptures could no more be intended to supersede the active duties of the ministry, than the written laws of the land could be understood to supersede the office of the judge. Indeed a similar principle runs throughout all the arts and sciences. There are books published upon them all, and yet hardly any one learns them until he has the advantage of *personal teaching*. But must the sick man suppose his physician to be infallible, because he trusts implicitly to his skill? Must the accused criminal suppose his lawyer to be infallible, because he confides in his superior professional knowledge? Must the apprentice to an ordinary trade believe that his master is infallible, because he

submits his ignorance to the master's instruction? Does the pupil in any of the branches of customary education hold the infallibility of his teachers, as a necessary justification of his placing himself under their tuition, instead of undertaking to teach himself? The answers to such questions are so obvious, that any child can make them. There is surely, then, nothing strange nor peculiar to religion in the fact, that while the rule of faith is indeed the Bible, yet no man learns that faith or is intended to learn it, from the Bible alone. The Bible is to the ministry, what the law is to the judge, what the science of medicine is to the physician, or what the established text book is to the teacher. And in the primitive days, before the Church was so sadly divided as it has since become, there was still less danger that those who desired to be instructed in religion should distrust the clergy; because there was comparatively but little difference of opinion amongst them: and yet the confidence placed in their instructions afforded no proof, that either they or their converts ascribed absolute infallibility to any thing except the inspired Word of God.

The third argument of our learned advocate is derived from the testimony of those primitive Christian writers, whose works have come down to our own day, and who, from the custom of the Church, are commonly known by the name of the fathers. And on this score I am quite sure that our cause has nothing to fear, when their testimony is fairly stated, and properly understood.

The first name which our learned advocate brings forward, is that of Augustin, the bishop of Hippo in Africa, who lived in the 4th century, and was the favourite author with Luther, the great German reformer. In his book against the Manichees, Augustin expressly saith, "I should not have believed the Gospel, if the authority of the Catholic Church had not moved me." "This little sentence contains at once," says Dr. Wiseman, "the principle on which Augustin believed.

This greatest light of the century in which he lived, declares, that he could not have received the Scriptures, except on the authority of the Catholic Church." (p. 114.)

Now although it is quite evident, that our learned advocate regards this statement of Augustin as a very important piece of evidence, yet there is really nothing in it to which we have the slightest objection.

The Scriptures are dictated by the Spirit of God, for the standard of the Church's faith, and are committed to the safe keeping of the officers of the Church, through whom they are made known to the world. As the Books of Moses were placed in the ark under the care of the priesthood, so the New Testament, along with the Old Testament, making the complete record of heavenly truth, were placed in the Church, under the care of the Christian priesthood. The authority of the Jewish Church, therefore, was the only authority which could move an inquirer to confess the writings of Moses and the Prophets. And in like manner, the authority of the Christian Church was the only authority which could move St. Augustin to acknowledge the writings of the evangelists and apostles. And as the Jewish Church could not possibly be mistaken about the first, so neither could the Christian Church be mistaken about the second. But what has this to do with the infallibility either of the Jewish Church or the Christian Church, when they talk to us about *traditions of the faith* which are not in Scripture?

Let us try to make this matter clear by a simple analogy. The laws of the legislature, in every civilized country, are committed to the custody of certain officers, and the originals are kept under their care in a place appointed for the purpose, called, in England and in some of the United States, the office of the rolls. Now suppose a foreigner, moved by the high character of any of these countries to inquire into its laws, should be assured by the officers who have them in custody,

that the records which they exhibited were the true transcripts of the acts of the legislature, doubtless he would at once believe them with the most implicit reliance; first, because these were the persons appointed for the guardianship of the records; and secondly, because these same laws, having been already copied, published, and dispersed far and wide through the land, any interpolation or forgery would be impracticable. To admit such records, therefore, demands no belief of the officers' *infallibility*, but only a confidence that they have used reasonable diligence and care, in a very simple matter.

But now suppose that these officers, after having the full acquiescence of the stranger in the truth of these records, should undertake to tell him, that the legislature had passed many other resolutions which were *equally binding with the written law*, but which were *not* to be found recorded, being only committed to the memory of their predecessors, and intended to be *handed down as the laws of tradition, from one set of officers to the other*, would the stranger be justified in believing such an assertion? And suppose that these officers should say, "Sir, we are the appointed keepers of the records of the legislature, and you acknowledge that the writings we have shown you are the real laws of the land. If we are trustworthy in keeping the books, why do you not admit that we are infallible in handing down the tradition? You have no right to believe the one, unless you are prepared also to believe the other." What would any reasonable mind think of such an argument? Could any thing be more absurd than to insist, that a legislative body would lay down half its laws in writing, and the other half in verbal tradition, and that an honest safeguard of the one, proved an infallible correctness about the other, merely because the *present keepers of the legislative records thought fit to say so*?

Now such is the precise position in which the Church of Rome places herself, by this, one of her most common and

plausible arguments. They say that the Church has been a faithful keeper and witness of Scripture—the *written records of the faith*—and we willingly grant it. And then they tell us, that if we allow them to have handed down faithfully the *records of the apostles*, therefore we must allow that they have handed down, with perfect infallibility, the *sayings of the apostles*, and that their *report of these sayings* shall be considered as much a part of our faith as the *written records themselves*. Surely, my brethren, there never was a plainer instance of false logic than this. Very different, when fairly understood, is the declaration of St. Augustin, that he could not have received the Scriptures, except on the authority of the Catholic Church; since this is precisely equivalent to our saying, that we could not receive the laws of the land, except on the authority of the officers appointed to publish them. Both these assertions are equally true, but neither of them has the slightest connexion with the infallibility of the Church in questions of oral tradition.

The next quotation which our author makes is from an earlier writer, Irenæus, the bishop of Lyons, who flourished in the next generation after the death of St. John. And his language, according to the translation of Dr. Wiseman, is as follows: “To him that believeth there is one God, and holds to the Head, which is Christ, to this man all things will be plain, if he read diligently the Scripture, with the aid of those who are the priests in the Church, and in whose hands, as we have shown, rests the doctrine of the apostles.” Here, truly, is a passage which the learned advocate would hardly have chosen, if it were not so impossible to find any writer of an early date, whose language could be brought even into seeming accordance with the modern doctrine of his Church. The words themselves express the very principle which we maintain; and cannot, without violence, be made to inculcate any other. For Irenæus simply asserts that all things will be plain to him

that believes in God, and holds the Head, that is Christ, *if he reads the Scriptures with the aid of the priesthood*. I have expressly stated, more than once, that the priesthood, being the successors of the apostles, are, to the Scriptures, what the judges are to the law. And just as he who would understand the law, must not only read the law itself but also the construction of the judges, so likewise must he who would understand the Scriptures, not only read the Scriptures themselves, but also have the interpretation of those, to whom the office of instruction and of government in the Church has been committed. What is there in this, to prove the infallibility of tradition? Manifestly nothing whatever.

Our author's third quotation is from Tertullian, who flourished in the next generation after Irenæus; and, as before, I shall take his own translation. "What will you gain," saith this eminent father, "by recurring to Scripture, when one denies what the other asserts? Learn rather who it is that possesses the faith of Christ; to whom the Scriptures belong; from whom, by whom, and when that faith was delivered, by which we are made Christians. For where shall be found the true faith, there will be the genuine Scriptures, there the true interpretations of them, and there all Christian traditions. Christ chose his apostles, whom he sent to preach to all nations. They delivered his doctrines and founded Churches, from which Churches others drew the seeds of the same doctrine, as new ones daily continue to do. Thus these, as the offspring of the apostolic Churches, are themselves esteemed apostolical. Now to know what the apostles taught, that is, what Christ revealed to them, recourse must be had to the Churches which they founded, and which they instructed by word of mouth and by their epistles. For it is plain, that all doctrine which is conformable to the faith of these mother Churches is true; being that which they received from the apostles, the apostles from

Christ, Christ from God; and that all other opinions must be novel and false."

"Is not this," saith Dr. Wiseman, "precisely the very rule which the doctrine of the Catholic Church," (meaning the Church of Rome) "proposes at the present day?" I answer confidently that *it is not*; although it may be so applied as to look like it, to an ill-informed or careless reader. On the contrary, it is in exact conformity with the principle, that the rule of faith is in the Scriptures, while the guardianship of the Scriptures, the interpretation of them, the forms and practices connected with worship and the sacraments, and the details of discipline, were committed to the Church. To understand the passage aright, therefore, it should be noted, first, that it occurs in a book which Tertullian wrote against the Gnostic heretics of his day, who mutilated the Word of inspiration, in order that they might deny the faith, in the all-important doctrines of the divinity, humanity, and sacrifice of Jesus Christ. They virtually destroyed the testimony of the Scriptures, by wantonly casting aside every part of the gospels and epistles which did not suit them. They abolished the Old Testament, under the blasphemous notion that the Jewish dispensation was established, not by the Supreme God, but by an evil being whom they called the *Demiurgus*, and whom it was the chief design of the Gospel to overcome. They taught that Christ was not God, but one of thirty celestial beings whom they called *æons*, and that he had no human nature, but only assumed the form of man to deceive the Jews. They said that he was not crucified at all, but that this also was a delusion. And along with these impieties, they indulged themselves in many practices of the most shocking immorality; so that to them, chiefly, were imputed the scandalous reproaches, so often made among the heathen against the Christian name.

You will now be able, my brethren, to understand aright the argument presented by Tertullian, knowing against whom, and

for what purpose, the passage was written. It is evident, that in arguing against these flagitious heretics, there was nothing to be gained by reasoning from Scripture, because they denied the true Scriptures, and endeavoured to set up false ones in their stead. Hence, the first step was to bring them, as it were, to the very birth-places of Christianity, to induce them to recur to the Churches planted by apostolic hands, that from their testimony they might learn which the real Scriptures were, and how the successors of the apostles interpreted them. In Tertullian's days, this was easily done ; because he lived only one century later than the apostle John, and there was not time for any apostolic Church to have become much changed, or at all corrupted. And therefore he tells the heretics to go to these places where the Gospel was first planted ; to Corinth, or to Ephesus, or to Rome, because there they would find the true Scriptures, the pure faith, the correct interpretation, and all those Christian traditions of forms, discipline and worship, which belonged to the practical administration of the Gospel system. Surely it is manifest that the passage, thus explained, is consistent and clear ; and that in arguing with such men, no other course could have been taken. But it results, incontrovertibly, that the language of Tertullian has no bearing upon the points under consideration, namely, the authority of *tradition* in adding to the doctrines of faith things not contained in Scripture, and the *infallibility* in pronouncing upon these traditions, claimed by the Church of Rome. The traditions mentioned by Tertullian may be understood much more reasonably as referring to points of practice, rather than points of faith ; and as to infallibility, he does not say one word about the matter.

Our author adds some other extracts from Origen, Cyprian, Chrysostom, and Epiphanius : but as they are not so strong as those which I have just examined, I shall not detain you by

commenting on them. Rather let me proceed to show you how these same fathers speak, upon our side of the question.

To begin with Augustin. In a set of most interesting meditations, being the 11th book of his *Confessions*, (1 Vol. 147, § 3) this language occurs, relative to the Scriptures. "O Lord my God, hasten to my prayer, and let thy mercy hearken to my supplication. Let thy Scriptures be my pure delight; may I neither be deceived in them, nor deceive others from them." Again, in his epistle to the Donatists, who had separated from the Church schismatically, although otherwise orthodox, he saith, (2 Vol. 228, § 14) "In the Scriptures we learn Christ, in the Scriptures we learn the Church. Those Scriptures we have in common: Why do we not hold together in them, in Christ, and the Church." (§ 17) "If in Christ, of whom you only read without seeing him, you nevertheless believe, by reason of the truth of the Scriptures, why do you deny the Church, which you both read and see?" And again, speaking of the Donatists in his epistle to Boniface, (2 Vol. 490, § 2) he repeats the sentiment in still stronger words. "Let us pray for them," saith he, "that the Lord may open their minds to understand the Scriptures. Because in the sacred books, where our Lord Christ is manifested, there also is his Church declared. But wonderful is their blindness, since, while they cannot know Christ himself, except by the Scriptures, nevertheless they do not acknowledge the Church by the authority of the same Scriptures." Here you perceive, brethren, that while Augustin appeals to the authoritative testimony of the Church, in one place, for the purpose of ascertaining which are the Scriptures, yet after that point is established, he looks to the doctrine of the Scriptures for the knowledge both of Christ and the Church.

Again, in his epistle to Consentius, (2 Vol. p. 584, § 3) warning him to be content with the simple words of Scripture on the subject of Christ's resurrection, Augustin says, "Christ

added no more; therefore let us inquire no farther.”—“For *whatever any one may add to the Scripture, let him take heed that he adds not corruption, lest he contaminates the purity and health of his faith.*” And once more, in another epistle to the same, (2 Vol. p. 266, § 13) Augustin expressly declares, that heresy arises out of the misunderstanding of the Scriptures. “For all heretics,” saith he, “who receive the Scriptures as authority, seem to themselves to be following the Scriptures when they are following their own errors; and therefore they are heretics, not because they despise the Scriptures, but *because they do not understand them.*” Surely, brethren, these few extracts must suffice to show, that this witness of Dr. Wiseman’s own selecting, regarded the Scriptures as the true **RULE OF FAITH**, while he looked to the Church for the safe guide of interpretation.

Let us next hear Tertullian, another of the witnesses already referred to on the Roman side of the argument. In the same book cited by Dr. Wiseman, (207) he calls the Scriptures the “**LETTERS OF FAITH**,” and repeating the heretic’s favourite maxim, “Seek and you shall find,” he saith, (p. 205) “I willingly grant that it is said to all; Seek and you shall find. Nevertheless, it is expedient that the *true sense of Scripture* should be sought *under the government of interpretation.*” This is precisely the view we have taken of the whole subject. The Scriptures furnish the law or rule of faith; and the Church, in her authorized priesthood, furnishes the interpreter. Again, the same father, alluding to the apostolic Churches, saith, that “they still retained the very chairs which the apostles occupied, and their authentic *epistles*, sounding the voice and representing the countenance of each one,” (p. 215) and he proceeds in these words, speaking of a believer who should have gone over all these Churches: “Let us see what he would have learned, and what he should be prepared to teach. He acknowledges one God, the Creator of the universe, and Jesus

Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, the Son of God the Creator, and the resurrection of the body. He unites *the law and the prophets with the Scriptures of the Evangelists and Apostles, and from thence HE DRINKS HIS FAITH*: he signs it with water, he clothes it with the Holy Spirit, he feeds it with the Eucharist, he exhorts it to martyrdom, and he receives no one who opposes this sacred institution." In the following page, he speaks of the Scriptures in these words: "Wherever a diversity of doctrine is found, there also is the **ADULTERATION OF THE SCRIPTURES**, and of the *interpretation of them*. For those who purpose to teach a different doctrine, are forced by necessity to alter the instruments of doctrine." Here he calls the Scriptures by their true title, the *instruments of doctrine*, which is precisely equivalent to their being the **RULE OF FAITH**. Again, describing their assemblies for worship, in his celebrated apology, written to influence the Roman Emperors to cease their persecution, he saith, "We meet together, (p. 31) to be refreshed in our minds by **THE HOLY SCRIPTURES**. We *feed our faith* by the divine Words, we elevate our hope, we establish our confidence." Again, saith he, (35) "We have now shown our whole condition, and in what manner we can prove that it is as we have declared it, namely, by *the faith* and antiquity of the **DIVINE SCRIPTURES**." A volume might be written, brethren, filled with extracts from these authors, all going to the same point; but our limits force me to be brief, and therefore I pass on to another of Dr. Wiseman's witnesses, whose testimony you will find in no respect at variance with what has been already laid before you.

Irenæus (p. 156) saith, "**THE SCRIPTURES** truly are perfect, because they are dictated by the Word and Spirit of God." And again, "We have known the plan of our salvation," saith he, (p. 173) "only through those by whom the Gospel was delivered to us, which truly they preached, but which afterwards, by the will of God, they delivered to us in **THE SCRIP-**

TURES, to be *the foundation and the pillar of our faith*. For after our Lord rose from the dead, and they were clothed with the power of the Holy Ghost descending upon them from heaven, they were filled with all spiritual gifts, and had perfect knowledge; and thus they went forth to the ends of the earth, announcing celestial peace to men, and each having committed to him the Gospel of God. Accordingly," continues Irenæus, "Matthew set forth his Gospel, about the time when Peter and Paul preached at Rome, and founded the Church there. And after their departure, Mark, the disciple and companion of Peter, delivered in writing those things which were preached by Peter. And Luke, the follower of Paul, set down in a book the Gospel as it was preached by Paul. And afterwards John, the disciple of the Lord, who reclined on his breast, published his Gospel during his abode at Ephesus. And all these delivered unto us the one God, Maker of heaven and earth, announced by the law and the prophets, and one Christ the Son of God." Here, brethren, we have the simple doctrine of the primitive Church, for Irenæus was the bishop of Lyons in the next generation after the death of the apostle John, and he states that the Scriptures contained the whole of the apostles' preaching, and that they were delivered to the Church, by the will of God, to be *the ground and pillar of the faith*. Nothing can be more direct to the point, nothing more conclusive.

Let us next hear Cyprian, the celebrated bishop of Carthage, who flourished in the next century after Irenæus, and who is also one of Dr. Wiseman's chosen witnesses. In the dispute between him and Stephen, then bishop of Rome, of which we shall have occasion to speak more fully hereafter, Cyprian argues against the authority of the tradition which Stephen had adduced, touching a matter, however, which was rather a point of discipline than a doctrine of faith, namely, whether the baptism performed by heretics should be repeated by the

Catholic Church or not. Nevertheless, although it was only a point of discipline, mark how Cyprian speaks of the principle. "Whence," says he, "is this tradition?" (Ch. of Rome, p. 129, Am. ed.) "Is it that which descends from the authority of our Lord and of his Gospel, or which comes to us from the precepts of the apostles and their epistles? For *those things which are written* are to be done, as the Lord testifies and proposes to Joshua, saying, 'This book of the law shall not depart from thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do all things which are written therein.' In like manner, the Lord, sending his apostles, commands them to teach and baptize the nations, that they may observe all things which were commanded them. If therefore," continues Cyprian, "it is either *directed in the Gospel, or contained in the epistles of the apostles or in the acts*, let this DIVINE AND HOLY TRADITION BE OBSERVED. But how great is this obstinacy, how bold this presumption, to place this human tradition before the divine sanction, forgetting that God is always indignant and wrathful, whenever human traditions are exalted above his precepts." I think, brethren, that no one who reads this passage can be in doubt, whether Cyprian held the Scriptures to be the rule of faith, for the nature of the dispute proves, that he not only held them to be the rule of faith, but the rule of practice also.

Cyril, the archbishop of Jerusalem, is another witness cited by the advocate of tradition, and therefore let us listen to his testimony, which will not detain us long, and is directly to the purpose. "The faith," saith he, "which the Church delivers to you in the form of the Creed, to be embraced and learned and professed, is *fenced all around by the Scriptures*. For as all cannot read the Scriptures, and some are hindered from a proper knowledge of them by unskilfulness, and others by press of occupation, we comprehend the universal system of faith in a few verses, lest the soul of any should perish by

ignorance. Retain this faith in your memory, and as you have opportunity, take the contents of each head *from the holy Scriptures*. For this summary of the faith was not composed according to the fancy of men, but the most important heads were *selected from the whole Scripture* to perfect and complete the one doctrine of FAITH. And in like manner as a grain of mustard seed contains many branches in a little space, so does this *faith* involve within it all the knowledge of piety *contained in the Old and the New Testament*. Behold therefore," saith Cyril in conclusion, "and hold these traditions which you now receive, and write them on the tables of your hearts." Surely, my brethren, nothing can exceed the force and plainness of this testimony, that the rule of faith in the primitive Church, was the rule which we profess—the Holy Scriptures.

In another part of his celebrated books, the same Cyril has this observation, (p. 155) "Since there are many things in Scripture which we do not fully understand, why should we trouble our minds with *what is not in Scripture?*"

Again, (p. 170) he asks, "Are not the *divine Scriptures* our salvation?"

And again, (p. 244.) "The Holy Ghost," saith Cyril, "dictated *the Scriptures*—Let us say therefore those things which were spoken by Him: whatever He has not said, we dare not."

To conclude the testimony of the fathers upon this important point, brethren, I shall cite but one passage more, and this shall be from Vincent of Lerins—a witness whose evidence Dr. Wiseman calls triumphant, although he does not quote his words. In answer to the question, How, in reading the Holy Scriptures, the true Christian shall be directed against the danger of misconstruction, Vincent replies, that "*the sacred Scriptures must be interpreted* according to the sense which Ecclesiastical tradition in the Catholic and apostolic Church

shall sanction, always observing the rules of universality, antiquity and consent." (p. 360.) Or, as the same author has elsewhere expressed it, "In the Catholic Church herself we must take care to hold only that which has been believed every where, and always, and by all. For this alone is truly and properly Catholic." And such, brethren, is the rule we have been all along defending: the Scriptures as the written law, interpreted by the Church, when the Church was justly called Catholic, that is, general or universal. And therefore we are always ready to have our doctrine tried by this standard, and join most willingly in the appeal to the interpretation of the primitive fathers, because we know that the nearer their writings come to the pure beginning of Christianity, the more they will be found to justify us in our controversy with the Church of Rome. For the very design and object of the English Reformation, was to bring back the Church of Christ to the original standard of primitive Christianity; and the fundamental complaint made against the Church of Rome was, that she had brought in novelties upon the original system, and that she defended them, not by arguments drawn from Scripture, according to the interpretation of the primitive Church, but by relying on the assumption that she was infallible, and could not go astray, and that therefore all her doctrines must be placed on an equality with the Gospel.

But here, my beloved brethren, we must release you from a series of argument and proof, which I fear you have found too long and too dry to be otherwise than uninteresting, but which I knew not how to abbreviate in justice to the truth. Our next topic, namely, the Papacy, together with the subject of the Councils, will occupy several discourses, every portion of which will have a direct bearing on the points we have been discussing, and the evidence to be adduced will accumulate as we go on, so as to demonstrate, more and more clearly, the fallaciousness of the claim, which the Church of Rome has for

centuries advanced, to be called *infallible* and Catholic. Ah! were she indeed entitled to these epithets, what miseries and wretchedness might have been spared to the Christian world! Had she indeed been possessed of such attributes, how absurd would it have been to make any attempt at Reformation! To her innovations upon that primitive Church which was truly Catholic, the necessity of the Reformation must be imputed; and if that Reformation has brought along with it the inevitable evils of disunion, it is not so much to be charged upon the reformers, as upon the awful degeneracy, which was not only the sole plea for their perilous task, but which could alone, under God, have made such an enterprise successful. Nor are the modern relaxations of all religious discipline, and the prevailing indifference to ecclesiastical authority, effects for which the cause assigned is not abundantly sufficient, on the most familiar principles of human action. The fetters of spiritual despotism once broken, licentiousness of course would follow. Excess of form and ceremony once exposed, contempt of all form would be likely to succeed it. The claims of infallibility once proved to be an usurpation, a disregard of all authority above that of private judgment would prevail. Indulgences and superstitions made profitable to the priesthood, once brought down from their unjust elevation, would be necessarily replaced by the cry of priestcraft against the whole theory and practice of true religion; the name of saint, once honourable, would become a byword of derision; and all the bands of veneration for the decision of the Church, in her ancient and her better days, would be cast aside, as part and parcel of popery. Thus has it always been, that one extreme produces its opposite; and such was the working of the principle in the progress of the Reformation, that nothing but the restraining hand of God himself could have kept it within any moderate bounds, and brought out of the chaotic elements of that tremendous conflict, a result which, on the whole, has been

so pure and beneficial. To the rule of faith set up by the Church of Rome, may be fairly ascribed all the evil. To the rule of faith which restored the Bible to its primitive ascendancy should be attributed all the good, and to the Lord alone should be ascribed all the "glory and the praise, for his mercy and truth's sake."

May the influence of that only infallible standard be manifested more and more, my beloved brethren, until the Church of Rome herself shall have returned to her own first profession; and every discordant portion of the Church Universal shall be united once more, in Catholic harmony and peace.

LECTURE VI.

MATT. xvi. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19.—Jesus saith to them: But whom do you say that I am? Simon Peter answering, said: Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answering, said to him: Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona; because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee: That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.

THE words which I have read to you, my brethren, are taken from the Doway Bible, that is, the translation of the Scriptures allowed and approved by the Church of Rome, to which, in all questions of controversy between them and us, we are perfectly willing to appeal, so far as any mere translation is entitled to confidence. The passage itself is of cardinal importance to their claims, since on it, chiefly, they rest their distinguishing tenet of faith, viz: that the Pope or bishop of Rome, as the successor of the apostle Peter, is the earthly head of the Catholic or Universal Church, throughout the world; and that communion with him is necessary to salvation. The consideration of this article of the Roman creed forms the subject of the following lecture, and will probably require two lectures more in order to complete even a condensed discussion of it. For independently of the general

order of evidence and argument belonging to the tenet itself, it is rendered particularly difficult, not only because of the variety of sentiment existing with regard to it in the Church of Rome, but especially because no article of their creed has undergone a more serious change through the influence of the Reformation.

That we may explain it to you, brethren, with as much clearness and simplicity as we can, we shall first examine the scriptural evidence of the doctrine as it is set forth by Dr. Wiseman, in its modern and popular form; secondly, state the doctrine as it was professed before the Reformation, and as it continues to be held by the Popes to the present day; and thirdly, point out its influence upon the past history of the world: from which may be fairly inferred what its influence would probably be upon its future history, if ever, in the providence of God, it should again be suffered to prevail. Of these three topics, the first alone will be amply sufficient for the time allotted to the present lecture.

We shall now, therefore, without further preface, enter upon our allotted task, by stating Dr. Wiseman's definition of the doctrine. "What," saith he, "do Roman Catholics mean by the supremacy of the Pope?" And the following is his answer:—"It signifies that the Pope or bishop of Rome, as the successor of St. Peter, possesses authority and jurisdiction in all things spiritual over the entire Church, so as to constitute its visible head, and *the vicegerent of Christ upon earth*. The idea of this supremacy involves two distinct, but closely allied prerogatives: the first is, that the Pope is the *centre of unity*; the second, that he is the *fountain of authority*. By the first is signified that all the faithful must be in communion with him, through their respective pastors, who form an unbroken chain of connexion from the lowest member of the flock, to him who has been constituted its universal shepherd. To violate this union and communion constitutes the grievous

crime of schism, and destroys an essential constituent principle of Christ's religion." (P. 216, Vol. 1.)

"We likewise," continues our author, "hold the Pope to be the *source of authority*, as all the subordinate rulers in the Church are subject to him, and receive, directly or indirectly, their jurisdiction from and by him. Thus the executive power is vested in his hands, for all spiritual purposes within the Church; to him is given the task of confirming his brethren in the faith; his office is to watch over the correction of abuses and the maintenance of discipline; in case of error springing up in any part, he must make the necessary investigations to discover and condemn it, and either bring the refractory to submission, or separate them, as withered branches, from the vine. In cases of great and influential disorder in faith or practice, he convenes a General Council of the pastors of the Church, presides over it in person or by his legates; and sanctions, by his approbation, its canons or decrees." (P. 217.)

"This supremacy," adds Dr. Wiseman, "is of a character purely spiritual, and has no connexion with any temporal jurisdiction. The sovereignty of the Pope over his own dominions is no essential portion of his dignity; his supremacy was not the less before these dominions were acquired, and should the unsearchable decrees of Providence, in the lapse of ages, deprive the Holy See" (that is, the Church of Rome) "of its temporal sovereignty, as happened to the 7th Pius, through the usurpation of a conqueror, its dominion over the Church and over the consciences of the faithful, would not be thereby impaired." (P. 218.)

Let us here pause a moment, brethren, and contemplate the idea of the Church of Christ, presented to us by the system of our Roman Catholic brethren. You perceive that it is a perfect monarchy, of which the Pope is the head, under the name of Christ's vicegerent, but with an extent of empire and pre-

rogative far beyond those of any other potentate. And that I may not be supposed to speak without authority, I quote, once more, the words of our learned advocate. "The Church of Christ has been presented to you," saith he, in the opening of the same discourse, "under the form of a sacred kingdom, wherein all the parts are cemented and firmly bound together, in unity of belief and practice, resulting from a common principle of faith, under an authority constituted by God . . . The tendency of every institution in the Church to produce and cherish this religious unity . . . will lead us naturally to suppose, that the authority which principally secures it must likewise be convergent in its exercise towards the same attribute. We saw," continues he, "how, in the old law, the authority constituted to each, narrowed in successive steps, till it was concentrated in one man and his line; we saw how all the figures of the prophets lead us to expect a form of government justly symbolized as *a Monarchy*; and although God is to be its ruler, and the Son of David its eternal Head, yet as their action upon man is invisible and indiscernible, while the objects and ends held in view, such as unity of faith, are sensible and dependent on outward circumstances, we might naturally hope to find some such vicarious or representative authority as would, and alone could, secure them in the Church." (215, 6.) I have troubled you, brethren, with this passage, simply for the purpose of proving, by Dr. Wiseman's own plain admission, that the form of government in the Church of Rome is a monarchy, of which Christ is truly the eternal King, but of which the Pope, as Christ's vicegerent, is the earthly or temporal sovereign. Now in contradistinction from this, we maintain that the Church is indeed a kingdom *in its spiritual relation to Christ*, but in no other respect whatever; that in its earthly organization it is designed to form, not a kingdom, but a vast republic, the Scriptures containing its constitution and its laws, the bishops and the clergy in their several dis-

tricts being the instructors and the judges, while the rights of the people are secured by the universal principle, that no one can be appointed either as instructor or judge, until he is freely approved by themselves. I mention this strong distinction now, because it forms the great dividing line between the two systems, so far as the mere question of government is concerned. The error of the Roman doctrine becomes of far more serious consequence, when it is considered as a point of faith, essential to salvation.

We are next to enter upon the evidence which our learned advocate relies on, to justify his definition. "The pre-eminence claimed by Roman Catholics for the bishop of Rome or the Pope," saith he, "being based upon the circumstance that he is the successor of St. Peter, it follows, that the right whereby that claim is supported must naturally depend upon the demonstration, that the apostle was possessed of such a superior authority and jurisdiction. First, then, we must examine whether St. Peter was invested by our Saviour with a superiority, not merely of dignity, but of jurisdiction also, over the rest of the apostles; and if so, we must further determine, whether this was merely a personal prerogative, or such as was necessarily transmitted to his successors to the end of time."

According to this division of his argument, Dr. Wiseman proceeds to allege the text, as proof that the authority in question was conferred by our Saviour on St. Peter. "Whom say ye that I am?" saith our Lord to his apostles. "Simon Peter answering said, 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answering, said to him: Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in

heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." It may be proper to repeat, brethren, by the way, that not only this passage, but every other quotation from Scripture in this lecture, is taken from the Roman version, commonly called the Doway Bible.

There is another text referred to, in addition to this, where, according to the Gospel of St. John, our Saviour, after his resurrection, asked Peter three times whether he loved him, and three times gave him a charge to feed his sheep and his lambs; meaning, as the Church of Rome professes to believe, the whole flock—apostles and all. Some considerable patience and attention will be necessary to understand the argument, which, out of these materials, professes to construct the mighty fabric of papal supremacy.

The first branch of the evidence is derived from the name *Peter*, given by our Lord to the apostle. Our learned advocate asserts that it signifies the same thing as the rock on which the Saviour promises to build his Church, because the language spoken by our Lord was *Syriac*; and in that language, there is but one word to signify the name of the apostle, and a rock or a stone. So that the translation, according to this notion, should be, *Thou art a rock, and on this rock I will build my Church*. Hence Dr. Wiseman concludes, that the rock on which the Church was to be built, was Peter, personally and individually; and this he calls the first prerogative of the apostle.

Now in answer to this, I would observe, in the first place, that we do not know whether our Saviour spake in Syriac, or in Chaldee. If in the latter, then there are two words, (*kiph* and *kipha*) instead of one, just as there are in the original Greek, and likewise in their own Latin Vulgate. It may next be observed, that the assertion is made in the very face of the Greek original, as well as their own Latin version, where the word signifying Peter, and that which signifies the rock, are

indeed from the same root, but vary nevertheless both in gender and in termination. The word translated Peter, means properly a stone, and we grant, most readily, that the apostle was a principal foundation-stone in the building of the Church. But the rock on which Peter himself, together with the whole Church, was built, is the Rock of ages, the rock CHRIST, the rock which Peter confessed, when he said "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God."

In order to understand this matter thoroughly, however, it must be observed, that the passage is figurative, or metaphorical; and therefore, according to the cardinal rule of interpretation, it must be interpreted in strict consistency with the subjects of the Saviour's promise, which are two; namely, Peter and the Church. With regard to the Church, it is often called in Scripture, a spiritual temple, a building fitly framed together in the Lord. Being a divine structure, it can stand on none other than a divine foundation, upon the rock of God's own infinite love and mercy in Christ. "Therefore, behold," saith the Lord by the prophet Isaiah, "I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation." (Is. xxviii. 16.) Which text the Roman expositors allow to mean none but the Redeemer. "No one can lay another foundation but that which is laid," saith St. Paul, (1 Cor. iii. 11,) "which is CHRIST JESUS." "Be you," saith St. Peter himself, "as living stones built up, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood." (1 Pet. ii. 5.) In these passages we see the Church, the spiritual temple, constructed of all the people of God as living stones, and resting upon Christ, the eternal rock, as their sure foundation. Thus far the figure is consistent and plain. Now when we look from the Church, to the individual case of Peter, it is obvious that he must have been himself one of these lively stones in this spiritual house: for otherwise, being personally a sinner like the rest, he could not have been a partaker of Christ's salvation. But surely it

would be absurd to say, that the foundation on which a building stands, can be, at the same time, a stone in the wall of the building. And therefore we may perceive, that it is totally inconsistent with the figure which our Lord employed, to regard Peter as being a lively stone in the edifice of the Church, and at the same time to consider him as the rock which sustained the whole. In a secondary sense, however, the word foundation is applied to signify the lower parts of a building; those which are first laid down, and on which the *superstructure* is designed to be erected. And in this sense it would be totally irreconcilable with the correct structure of the metaphor, to talk of but *one stone for the whole building*. The principal foundation was one, for it was the Rock—Christ Jesus. But the secondary foundation could not be one stone, but many. Hence we read that Abraham, the father of the faithful, “looked for a city that hath *foundations*,” (Heb. xi. 10,) viz: the heavenly Jerusalem, whose builder and maker is God. And accordingly the wall of this new Jerusalem is described in the book of the Revelations, (xxi. 14,) as having “*twelve foundations*, and in them, the twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb.” Now here we have the very word applied by St. John himself, not to Peter only, but to the whole twelve of the apostles; and although it may be readily allowed that the honour of being the first stone laid in the foundation belongs to Peter, yet that is a very different matter from having the whole Church, apostles and all, built upon him alone.

Thus much may suffice, for the present, upon the text, so far as it regards the name of Peter, and the rock of his faith and confession, Christ. There are other considerations to be mentioned by and by, which will show that this is the only consistent meaning. But let us pass on to examine the next prerogative granted to him; “I will give to thee,” saith our Lord, “the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and

whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.”

Our learned advocate takes considerable pains to prove, that this text imports certain powers of authority and government over the Church. And we dispute it not. The words are too strong and clear to admit of controversy. But whether these powers were peculiar to Peter, and especially whether they were designed to give him a supremacy over the other apostles, are very different things, which can by no means be proved by the passage in question. For we must carefully observe that our Saviour does not say “*I give thee,*” but “*I will give thee,*” plainly marking a promise to be fulfilled at some future time. A grant, precisely similar in substance, is made by our Lord a little afterwards to all the others, (xviii. ch. of Matt.) in these words; “Amen, I say unto you, whatsoever *you* shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever *you* shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven.” And the fulfilment of these promises is recorded by all the evangelists, although the promise made to Peter is mentioned by St. Matthew only. And here, brethren, I must ask your particular attention to a fact commonly overlooked in this argument, and yet in my mind conclusive as to the true sense of the Scriptures. It is the fact that our Saviour’s personal ministry was of necessity confined to the Jews, until the offering of his great atonement for the whole world. Hence he declares so clearly: “I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.” And consequently, in the first commission given to his apostles he expressly saith, (Matt. x. 5.) “Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into the cities of the Samaritans enter not. But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; and going, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand.” But after his precious sacrifice was completed, and he had arisen in triumph from the dead, the field was gloriously enlarged. “All power,” saith he to his apos-

bles, "is given to me in heaven and in earth." And the full commission is now *bestowed* upon them which had been *promised* long before, "Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature." We see from this, distinctly, that the words addressed to Peter in the first instance, could not have been intended to confer upon him at that time any immediate privilege of government in the Catholic or Universal Church, because the Church in its enlarged and Catholic aspect was not committed to them until after the Saviour's resurrection. And hence it follows, that as the promise must of necessity be referred to a *subsequent fulfilment*, the fulfilment itself must be taken as its only certain interpreter; for that which Christ *did*, we may be quite sure, was the very thing which he had *promised to do*.

Now although, as I have stated, the actual fulfilment of the promise by the grant of the apostolic commission, is carefully recorded by all the evangelists, yet its detail is most complete in the Gospel of St. John. And there we read it in the following terms: "As the Father hath sent me," saith the Saviour, "I also send you. When he had said this, he breathed on them; and he said to them, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them. And whose sins you shall retain, they are retained.*" Here then, we have the whole extent of the high and holy authority which constituted the apostles the ambassadors of heaven. "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you." Not a promise for the future, "*I will send,*" or "*I will give,*" but "*I DO SEND, now.*" And the power is forthwith conferred, without which the commission could never have been executed. He breathes on them and saith: "*Receive ye the Holy Ghost.*" The spiritual work requires the spiritual faculty, and both are provided for in their appointed season. We see therefore in this, the whole explanation of the matter. No separate commission is granted to Peter. The promise was made at one period to

him, and at another to his brethren, but all are united in the ONE FULFILMENT, all receive the same authority, all become foundations in the spiritual building—the Church of God.

As for the other text, where our Lord asks Peter three times, whether he loves him, and receiving each time an affirmative answer, (John xxi. 15, &c.) charges the penitent apostle thrice, to feed his sheep and his lambs, there really seems to be nothing in it, on which it would be possible to found an argument for Peter's supremacy. And yet the advocates for the prerogatives of the pope imagine, that in these words our Lord committed the whole Church, apostles and all, to the peculiar care of Peter. It is not a little interesting to observe how very different a construction Peter himself puts upon his office, when giving, in his first epistle, (v. ch. 1, 2, 3,) a similar charge. "The ancients therefore," saith he, "that are among you, I beseech, who am myself also an ancient, and a witness of Christ, as also a partaker of that glory which is to be revealed in time to come, feed the flock of God which is among you, taking care thereof, not by constraint but willingly, according to God, neither for the sake of filthy lucre, but voluntarily; neither as domineering over the clergy, but being made a pattern of the flock from the heart. And when the Prince of pastors shall appear, you shall receive a never fading crown of glory." Here the apostle, according to the Roman Catholic theory, and the practice of the popes who call themselves his successors, ought to have reminded the elders of his sovereign authority. Instead of saying, "I beseech you, who am also an ancient and a witness of Christ," he should have said: "I exhort you, who am the supreme ruler and vicegerent of Christ, to whose charge and government you are all committed." Setting aside the forced and unnatural construction, however, which Dr. Wiseman and his brethren endeavour to put upon the narrative of St. John, the peculiar circumstances of St. Peter at the time will readily point out the true meaning. He

had thrice denied his Master—the only one of the eleven who had so deeply disgraced his apostolic character. And his compassionate Lord kindly affords him the opportunity to make three professions of his love, in order to wipe out the humiliation of his three denials. And still further to show that the Saviour had fully restored him to favour, He gives him the apostolic charge to feed his sheep, which is the indispensable duty of every pastor. As to the expression from which our learned advocate would fain draw an inference of favour, “lovest thou me more than these?” it is surely enough for us to remember the principle laid down by the Redeemer, in the case of another flagrant but penitent transgressor: “Many *sins are forgiven her*, because she hath *loved much*.” (Luke vii. 47.)

There are a number of minor arguments which our Roman advocates are in the habit of advancing in favour of St. Peter’s supremacy; and although at the risk of wearying you, my brethren, I am desirous to examine them all, before I turn to the decisive contradiction which other portions of the Sacred Volume seem to furnish against the papal doctrine. One of these arguments is derived from the statement of St. John, that our Saviour gave St. Peter a new name when he was first brought to him by his brother Andrew: (John i. 42) “Thou shalt be called Cephias, which is interpreted, Peter.” And Dr. Wiseman ingeniously compares it to the cases of Abram and Jacob, because the new name given to the first, imported, that Abraham should be the father of many nations, and the appellation conferred upon the second signified, that the patriarch should be a prince with God. And hence, if his readers could be induced to think that Peter’s name was intended to signify that he should be the spiritual father of the world and the prince of the whole Church, it would undoubtedly be a great point gained towards the doctrine of the pope’s supremacy.

But the simple truth is, that in Scripture, the giving a new

name is only the designation of the character, according to the design of God, whether it be for honour or dishonour. Thus in the book of Hosea, (i. 4, 6, 9,) we read that The Lord gave names to the three children of the prophet. His wife bore a son, "And the Lord said to him, call his name Jezrahel, for yet a little while and I will visit the blood of Jezrahel upon the house of Jehu, and I will cause to cease the kingdom of Israel." Again she bore a daughter, and he said to him, "Call her name Lo-ruhamah," (which signifies, *without mercy*), "for I will not add any more to have mercy on the house of Israel, but will utterly forget them." And again she bore a son. "And he said, call his name Lo-ammi," (which signifies, *not my people*), "for you are not my people, and I will not be your God." We see from this, of which there are many other examples, that the giving of a name is not always an indication of privilege or favour, but sometimes the very contrary; and therefore it results, that each case must be viewed in connexion with its own circumstances, and be interpreted accordingly. Now in compliance with this plain rule of justice, let the name given to Peter be considered in the light of his own Gospel, that is, the Gospel of St. Mark, for I have already had occasion to mention, that this Gospel was universally regarded by the ancient fathers as being the substance of the preaching of St. Peter, as the Gospel of St. Luke was of the preaching of St. Paul. In the 3d ch. of St. Mark's Gospel, then, we have it written, with great brevity and simplicity, (v. 16, 17) that our Lord "gave to Simon the name of Peter; and James, the son of Zebedee, and John, the brother of James, he named Boanerges, which is *The sons of thunder*." Here, therefore, brethren, we have St. Peter's own account of this matter. On his own name he does not dwell, nor does he even mention its meaning. While he seems desirous to pay special regard to James and John, not only stating that our Lord also gave them names, but adding the sublime signification. And surely

it is obvious, that if any thing of supremacy or power is to be gathered from names merely, their names were far more likely to bear that character than Peter's. To be a *foundation stone* in the spiritual building of the Church, was indeed honourable and important, but the *thunders* were the appropriate tokens of God's own presence on Mount Sinai, and were never appointed to wait upon any inferior being. Indeed their most common association in Scripture, is with the Word of God and the power of God. Thus, in the book of Job, (xxvi. 14) "Who shall be able to behold the thunder of his greatness?" Again, in the Psalms, (civ. 7) "At thy rebuke, (O Lord) they flee, at the voice of thy thunder they shall fear." Again, in the Apocalypse, St. John, beholding in vision the throne of God, (iv. 5) saith, that "from the throne proceeded lightnings and voices and thunderings." And again, (x. 3) the mighty Angel whose description is such as can only belong to Christ himself, (xi. 3) is said to "come down from heaven clothed with a cloud, and a rainbow upon his head; and his face was as the sun, and his feet as pillars of fire, and he had in his hand a little book open; and he set his right foot upon the sea, and his left foot upon the land; and he cried out with a loud voice, as when a lion roareth, and when he had cried out, *seven thunders* uttered their voices." If, therefore, the circumstance of our Lord's giving names to his apostles, be indicative of privilege or favour, we see that he conferred a name on James and John as well as on Peter; and if power or authority is to be inferred from the signification of the names, it seems abundantly manifest that the supremacy would be, not on the side of him who was called a foundation stone, but rather on that of the sons of thunder.

Another class of passages is often adduced by the ingenious advocates of Roman supremacy, in which Peter appears the first to speak and to act, as if he were a kind of leader amongst the apostles. Now it is very true that he was the most for-

ward, ardent, and hasty of the apostolic company, on many occasions. Some of these instances are to his praise, and some the contrary. As for example, that noted instance of his rashness, (Mat. xvi. 22, 23) where he undertook to rebuke his Lord, contradicting the express prediction of the Saviour by saying: "Lord, be it far from thee; this shall not be unto thee. But he, turning, said unto Peter: Go after me, Satan, thou art a scandal unto me, because thou dost not relish the things that are of God, but the things that are of men." In this text, truly, the Roman expositors of the Doway Bible admit that the language might be translated, "Begone from me," or as our version has it, "*Get thee behind me,*" instead of "*Go after me, Satan.*" I quote their own Scriptures, however, as I have promised, in order to do their argument all the justice in my power. But even when the passage is thus softened, it is abundantly plain that St. Peter acted with singular temerity, and received a proportionate rebuke. Nor was the besetting sin of the warm-hearted apostle cured, even by this sharp reproof. For again, in the night before the crucifixion, when our Lord kindly predicts Peter's approaching denial, he refuses to believe the warning, and proud in his own self-confidence, falls into the snare of the tempter, at the very time when he thought himself ready to go with his divine Master to prison and to death.

That St. Peter, therefore, should be a kind of leader amongst the rest, is nothing strange, when we behold these proofs of his ardent temper, and remember that he is also supposed to have been the oldest of the band, and perhaps the only one who was at that time married. But if this were all for which our Roman brethren contended, we should not think it worth while to dispute the matter. Any one that carefully reads the Gospels will see, indeed, that there was no regular leader, no appointed spokesman, and nothing like an order of rank or precedence established amongst the apostles, while their Lord

was with them. And yet, if it had been otherwise, what would it prove for Peter's supremacy? Absolutely nothing. He that occupies the first place amongst his equals, surely does not thereby assert that he has any authority over them. What dominion has the presiding judge of a court, or the foreman of a jury, or the chairman of a committee, or the file-leader of a band of soldiers, over those who act with them? Manifestly none whatever. Questions of authoritative rule and government are never placed on such a trifling ground as mere precedency, even in the offices of earth. How much less should we be willing to admit so weak an evidence of supremacy, amongst the apostolic ministry of the Gospel!

The next argument of Dr. Wiseman has more apparent force, namely, that our blessed Saviour promised to Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that this promise imports dominion, and that it was given to him alone.

To this we answer, that the kingdom of heaven of which our Lord promised Peter the keys, signified the Church militant on earth, which is indeed the kingdom of heaven, because it consists of those who acknowledge the King of heaven for their Sovereign, whose Son is their Redeemer, whose Spirit is their Sanctifier, whose Word is their law, and whose promised glory is the recompense of their celestial reward. And thus we read of the application of the phrase continually. The kingdom of heaven is compared to ten virgins who took their lamps to meet the bridegroom, and five of them were wise, and five were foolish. Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net cast into the sea, in which were bad fish as well as good. Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a field, in which an enemy sowed tares among the wheat; in all which comparisons our Lord plainly points out the Church on earth, which contains the good and the evil, the true and the false; whereas the Church above, the new Jerusalem, will contain none but the holy and the pure. Again, the kingdom of heaven is

likened to a grain of mustard-seed, which, when it is sown, is the least of all seeds, but afterwards becometh a great tree, so that the fowls of the air can lodge among the branches: which points out the small beginning of the Church in the hands of the apostles, and its subsequent increase to its present magnitude. But neither the keys of the kingdom of heaven in the future world, nor yet the keys of the bottomless abyss, have ever been consigned to mortal hand. Hence, in our Lord's own description of the final day of account, it is not St. Peter but himself that occupies the throne of judgment; and the division of mankind into the two great ranks of the sheep and the goats, or the righteous and the wicked, is not made by the apostle, but by the angels of God. And in like manner we read in the Apocalypse, that St. John, in vision, beheld the Saviour, (1 ch. 17) and heard him saying, "Fear not, I am the First and the Last, and alive and was dead, and behold I am living for ever and ever, and have the *keys of death and of hell.*" Again we read, (ch. iii. 7) "These things saith the Holy One and the True One, who hath the *key of David*: He that *openeth and no man shutteth, shutteth and no man openeth.*" Here then, we see, that the keys promised to Peter could only have been the keys of the Church below—the kingdom of heaven upon earth; since about sixty years after our Lord's resurrection, as all agree, the Saviour expressly declares to St. John, that the keys of death and hell, and the key of David, which is the key of heavenly glory, are in his own hands.

This being distinctly understood, we are prepared to interpret, without any danger of error, the precise character of the keys promised to Peter. For it is exactly tantamount to the apostolic power of establishing the Church, by preaching the faith, on which, as on a rock, the Church was founded; prescribing its laws, rules, forms, and discipline; opening the door of the Church in baptism, shutting it in excommunication, and

regulating it in every point of order which its prosperity required; for all of which, as has been already stated, the apostles had the special gifts of the Holy Ghost; and in all of which, although St. Peter and St. Paul undoubtedly held a certain pre-eminence, yet the power of the keys and the authority of the apostolate was one and the same.

The last allegation that requires notice, brethren, is the promise of our Lord, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church, taken in connexion with the promise to build that Church on the rock—which rock our Roman Catholic advocate imagines to be the *person* of the apostle Peter, instead of the *faith* which he possessed. But it is perfectly obvious, that these words cannot afford any aid in settling the point in controversy. We all acknowledge that while the Church is built upon the rock, the gates or the powers of hell shall not prevail against it. The question whether the rock is Christ, or Peter, is the point at issue, and remains just as it was before.

I have now discussed the evidence of Scripture, on which Dr. Wiseman, in common with every Roman Catholic, rests the claim of St. Peter to be considered the prince, the pastor, and the ruler of the *other* apostles and of the whole Church of Christ. And the remainder of our lecture will be devoted to another class of passages, which to my mind, seem at war with their doctrine. I am, indeed, by no means free from fear, brethren, that so minute and prolonged an examination may weary you; but it should be remembered that the question is vital to the Church of Rome. In their esteem, this doctrine constitutes a *point of faith*, which cannot be rejected *without peril of damnation*. And therefore, in love to them, and in Christian affection for their spiritual welfare, as well as in justice to our blessed reformers, we ought to feel a lively interest in all that belongs to the discussion.

In the first place then, we remark, that if the Church of our Lord was really designed to be founded on the person of

Peter, so that on this depended the fulfilment of the promise, that the gates of hell should not prevail against it, we should expect to find the doctrine often repeated, placed in the clearest and the strongest light, and especially set forth by Peter himself and the other apostles.

Instead of which, the text which is mainly relied upon is a single text, occurring only in St. Matthew's Gospel, and not adverted to by Mark, Luke or John; nor is there any reference to the doctrine in all the acts of the apostles, nor any in the fourteen epistles of St. Paul, the general epistle of St. James, the two epistles of St. Peter himself, the epistle of St. Jude, the three epistles of St. John, and the Apocalypse or book of the Revelations. I do not say that the text is the less true, because it occurs but once. God forbid! But I do say, that whereas the article is maintained to be a cardinal part of the faith, and one which must have been brought into constant practical operation if the Roman view of it be true, it is unaccountable that we should never see it stated but once, and that, as I trust I have shown, in a manner which admits of a very different explication.

Manifest it is, that if the Saviour designed St. Peter to have been the prince, ruler and governor of the other apostles and of the whole Church, St. Peter himself must have known the fact, and felt it to be his solemn duty to make it known to others. How is it, then, that in St. Mark's Gospel—the Gospel which is universally acknowledged to contain the preaching of St. Peter—there is not one word about the matter? Again, we have two epistles of St. Peter's own writing, in which ingenuity itself cannot find one word that can be twisted into the shape of superior authority. The first begins thus: "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers dispersed throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia." The second commences in a similar style: "Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to them who have

obtained equal faith with us," addressed, doubtless, to the same persons as the former one, because, in the 3d chapter of it he saith, "Behold, this is the second epistle I write to you, my dearly beloved." In contrast with this, we have a *Catholic* or *general* epistle from the pen of the apostle Jude, and another from the apostle James. Why, if Peter supposed himself the ruler of the whole Church, did not he leave behind him at least some Catholic or general epistles? St. John, the other son of thunder, addresses Christians by the name, sometimes, of *Little children*, sometimes, *Infants*, sometimes, *Fathers*; but his favourite title is *Little children*. Whereas St. Peter only uses one appellation, and that is, *Brethren*. St. Paul speaks strongly of discipline, of the delivering of men unto Satan that they may learn not to blaspheme, and of his apostolic rod; but there is not a word of all this in the two epistles of him, who is imagined to be the *prince*, the *ruler*, the very **VICEGERENT OF CHRIST**. How could this be so, if St. Peter were what the Church of Rome supposes?

But this is far from being the whole of the Scriptural evidence against this claim. For we read, in the Gospels, of many occasions, on which the apostles disputed who should be the greatest; from which it is manifest, that this very question of supremacy was frequently discussed amongst them, and in every instance our blessed Lord discouraged it, and inculcated an humble equality. Thus, (Matt. xx. 25) when the mother of James and John desired a superior place for her children, and the other apostles were moved with indignation, we read, that "Jesus called them to him and said; you know that the princes of the Gentiles lord it over them; and they that are the greater exercise power upon them. *It shall not be so among you*; but whosoever will be the greater among you, let him be your minister; and he who would be the first among you, shall be your servant."

Again, (Matt. xxiii. 8) warning his apostles against the love

of superior station, he saith: "Be ye not called Rabbi: for one is your Master, and *all ye are brethren.*"

Again, (Luke ix. 46) we read, that "there entered a thought into them, which of them should be the greater. But Jesus, seeing the thoughts of their heart, took a child and set him by him; and said to them: Whosoever shall receive this child in my name, receiveth me; and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth him that sent me. For he that is the least among you all, he is the greatest."

Again, (Luke xxi. 24) "There was a strife amongst them, which of them should seem to be the greater. And he said to them: the kings of the Gentiles lord it over them, and they that have power over them are called benefactors. *But you not so:* but he who is the greatest among you, let him be as the least, and he that is the leader as he that serveth. For which is greater, he that sitteth at table or he that serveth? Is not he that sitteth at table? But I am in the midst of you as he that serveth; and you are they who have continued with me in my temptations; and I appoint unto you, as my Father hath appointed to me, a kingdom. That you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and may sit upon thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

Now all these instances of the apostles' solicitude upon the point of supremacy, are quoted from the Roman Catholic version, called the Doway Bible, and they are all related as having occurred *after* the promise of the keys, with the assurance that the Church should be built upon the rock, which every Roman theologian supposes to signify the grant of this supremacy to Peter. So that neither Peter nor his brethren could possibly have understood our Saviour's words according to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, for if they had, they surely would not afterwards have disputed which of them should be the greatest. That point, at least, they must have looked upon as settled in Peter's favour, and have treated

him with deference accordingly. Neither does it seem to me that the various reproofs of our Lord are consistent with the Roman interpretation; for on that ground, would he not have rebuked their want of acquiescence in his declared will, and have reminded them that he had constituted Peter their governor and chief already?

Passing on from the Gospels to the Acts of the Apostles, Peter appears prominently on several important occasions, as a speaker, a preacher, and a worker of miracles; but in no instance does he assert or exercise any superior power or dominion. So far from it, that on some of these, he looks like one more *ruled* than *ruling*. Thus, when the conversion of the Samaritans, through the ministry of Philip, was made known to the apostles who were in Jerusalem, (Acts viii. 14) "*they sent to them Peter and John.*" Here is an inversion of authority. Instead of Peter sending the other apostles, they send him. Again, (Acts xi. 2) when Peter returned from the conversion and baptism of Cornelius, and was "come up to Jerusalem, they who were of the circumcision disputed against him:" and Peter explains the whole matter, concluding by saying, "Who was I, that I could oppose God?" Neither he nor his accusers on this occasion, seem to have had any notion of his superior dignity, as the prince of the apostles and vicegerent of Christ.

Again, (Acts xv.) we read, that the apostles and elders came together to consider the question, whether the Gentile converts should be bound by the ceremonial law. And this is what the Roman Catholic doctors call the first Apostolic Council. But it certainly does not appear that Peter summoned this Council, nor that he presided over it, nor that he opened the proceedings, nor that he framed its definitive decree, nor that he performed any act of distinct approbation; nearly all of which would have belonged to his office, according to the Roman theory. "The apostles and elders came to-

gether," saith the Scripture. "When there was much disputing, Peter rose up," and delivered his opinion. After he had concluded, Barnabas and Paul related "what great signs and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them." "And after they had held their peace, *James* answered, saying; men, brethren, hear me. Simon hath told in what manner God first visited the Gentiles, to take out of them a people to his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets." "Wherefore I **JUDGE**," continues the apostle *James*, "that they who from among the Gentiles are converted to God, are not to be disquieted." . . . "Then it pleased the apostles and ancients, with the whole Church, to choose men of their own company, and to send them to Antioch, with Paul and Barnabas, Judas who was surnamed Barsabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren, writing by their hand: The apostles and ancients, brethren, to the brethren of the Gentiles, greeting," &c. Now throughout this whole important transaction, it is impossible to reconcile the facts with the Roman doctrine. For had St. Peter been then acknowledged as the ruler and chief, the *vicegerent of Christ*, to whose care the *whole Church*, apostles and all, had been committed, his single judgment would have been sufficient without any council; or at least, when the council assembled, he would have presided instead of *James*, and in the final decree, his name would have been specially set forth as the authoritative ruler of the whole matter.

But the evidence of Scripture does not rest here. We find the whole of the remaining portion of the book of the Acts, which is much the greater part, devoted chiefly to the labours of St. Paul, and Peter is hardly named again. Nor, if we take the sacred record in its own integrity, does there seem any room to doubt, that if the supremacy of one apostle over the others had been a part of the divine system, the claim of St. Paul to that supremacy would stand on by far the stronger

ground. Peter was indeed called first, and Paul last; but it is altogether consistent with many other parts of the divine economy, that the last should be first, and that the elder should serve the younger. The call of Peter was like that of the other apostles; but Paul was the subject of prophecy, he was converted by a vision, and was chosen in connexion with a miracle. His labours, his gifts, his sufferings, his share in the Scriptures of the New Testament, of which his writings form a larger portion than half the other authors put together,—his comprehensive, deep, and wonderful knowledge of divine truth—his being raised up into heaven, where he heard things not lawful for man to utter—take the whole of this together, brethren, and surely it cannot be disputed, that the weight of Scriptural evidence is greatly in his favour.

I shall add but two observations more to this protracted examination of the Word of God, upon the point before us. The one is, that St. Paul himself allows no supremacy to Peter. For this is his language in his epistle to the Galatians:—“James and Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go to the Gentiles and they to the circumcision.” Now here, brethren, we have Peter or Cephas named along with James and John, but not named first, nor with any kind of distinction. St. Paul merely says of the whole three, that they seemed to be pillars; and then expressly asserts, that he and Barnabas were to go to the Gentiles, and Peter to the circumcision. Where is Peter's supremacy, his government over the *whole Church*, his prerogative of authority as the *vicegerent of Christ*? Only imagine the Pope of Rome to be placed in this unceremonious style between two other bishops, and the contrast presented by his assumption of dignity on the one hand, and the unpretending equality of the apostle whose successor he calls himself on the other, will be manifest and plain.

The last point which I design to notice, is the clear proof afforded by the Acts of the Apostles, that St. Paul was expressly designed, in the order of Providence, to establish the Church at Rome; whereas St. Peter's being there would seem to have been merely incidental. So that, on a survey of the whole Scriptural evidence, we may surely conclude, that the doctrine of St. Peter's supremacy, together with the founding upon it the dominion of the Pope, and the making this dominion an article of faith necessary to every man's salvation, presents a combination of mistaken argument and melancholy intolerance, of which the history of the Christian Church affords no parallel, and which it is impossible to reflect upon without the strongest emotions of astonishment and sorrow.

You have probably anticipated the avowal, however, that the kind of evidence on which the advocates of Roman supremacy most confidently rely, is not derived from the Scriptures, but from the fathers. And to this branch of testimony, brethren, I am ready to appeal, and trust we shall be able to dispose of it satisfactorily, in our next lecture. We shall close the present by a brief recurrence to Dr. Wiseman's own argument on another point of his case, in order to show the manifest inconsistency of his premises with his conclusion.

Contending for the superiority of the Christian over the Jewish dispensation, in which we distinctly concur, and designing to derive from this an argument for the Church's infallibility, which we as distinctly deny, he observes, (p. 19) "the prophets in the first place, were the types of Jesus Christ, and we see Jesus Christ himself come and take their place, assuming here their ministry, promising to remain with his new kingdom, teaching therein always to the consummation of the world."

You perceive, brethren, that our learned advocate here asserts the abiding presence of Christ with the Church. In this we agree; but I ask for what purpose, then, serves the doctrine

of the pope's vicegerency? A vicegerent amongst earthly governments is one who holds the place and discharges the functions of an *absent monarch*. But Christ, our King, is *not absent*. His own gracious promise was given, to be with his apostles and their successors ALWAYS. Wherever two or three are gathered together in his name, he is pledged to be in the midst of them. To use the expressive figure of the book of Revelation, "He walketh among the seven golden candlesticks," He unites with the assemblies of his people in his sanctuaries; yea, He enters into the secret chamber of their inmost thoughts, He searcheth the hearts and trieth the reins of the children of men. And does He stand in need of a vicegerent? And shall a poor, infirm mortal, talk of being the vicar of the divine, the omnipresent, the omnipotent Son of God? Alas! which of the acts of Christ can this imaginary vicar perform? Can the pope of Rome say to each sorrowing heart throughout the world, "Thy sins be forgiven thee?" Can he watch over us in the hour of temptation? Can he hear and answer our prayers? Can he strengthen and protect our weakness? Can he mark our secret guilt in the book of his remembrance? Can he favour and bless our humble resolutions of repentance and amendment? O how strange, how strange; to admit that Christ is present, and yet to treat him as if he were absent, and needed a vicegerent! How strange, to acknowledge Christ as God, and yet suppose that a frail man can be his substitute! How strange, to adore Christ as the glorious King of heaven, and yet imagine that the blessed privilege of admission to his presence, is only to be granted through one weak mortal hand on earth!

Let us then, beloved brethren, rest satisfied and thankful in the enjoyment of that Scriptural religion, which beholds the Redeemer with the eye of faith, and receives his promises in their own beautiful simplicity, and seeks his blessing, not in the communion of a supposed earthly vicegerent, but in the living

presence of his Spirit in our souls. Our blessed Lord has built his Church upon himself, the Rock of ages. He has given unto us the ministry of reconciliation. Let all our hearts unite in the confession of the apostle, which acknowledged him to be the Christ, the anointed Saviour, the co-equal Son of the eternal Father; and then shall we be accounted the true citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem,—the eternal city, against which the gates of hell cannot prevail, whose maker and builder is God over all, blessed forever!

LECTURE VII.

MAT. xvi. 15, 19.—Jesus saith to them, But whom do you say that I am? Simon Peter answering said, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answering, said to him: Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona; because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.

THE text which I have just repeated, my brethren, was the theme of our last lecture, in which we commenced the examination of the cardinal principle of the Roman Catholic faith, the supremacy of the pope, or bishop of Rome, as the source of unity, the fountain of authority, the ruler and pastor of the whole Church throughout the world, holding the dominion of Christ's vicegerent upon earth, to whom obedience and submission are due by every soul, under the penalty of damnation. You recollect that these prerogatives, with many others necessarily implied in them, were attributed to the papacy in substance by Dr. Wiseman, the late and popular advocate of the Roman claims. But that you may the better understand the meaning of the doctrine, I shall here add the still more positive language of the Canon Law, established many centuries ago by the authority of the popes, and designed to furnish the entire legislative system of the Church of Rome, in distinct terms, for general observation.

“The Pope,” saith this Canon law, “by the Lord’s appointment, is the successor of the blessed apostle Peter, and holds the place of the Redeemer himself upon the earth.”

“The Roman Church, by the appointment of our Lord, is the mother and mistress of all the faithful.”

“The Roman Pontiff bears the authority, not of a mere man, but of the true God upon the earth.”

“The Pope holds the place of God in the earth, so that he can confer ecclesiastical benefices without diminution.”

“Christ, the King of kings and Lord of lords, gave to the Roman Pontiff, in the person of Peter, the plenitude of power.”

“Wherever there is any question concerning the privileges of the apostolic chair, they are not to be judged by others. The Pope alone knows how to determine doubts concerning the privileges of the chief apostolic seat.”

“It was becoming, since the chief Pontiff represents the person of Christ, that as during Christ’s earthly ministry the apostles stood round him, so the assembly of the cardinals representing the apostolic college, should stand before the Pope: but the rest of the bishops, scattered abroad every where, represent the apostles sent forth to preach the gospel.”*

These extracts from the Canon law of the Church of Rome, brethren, will explain more clearly the doctrines of Dr. Wiseman; for although there is no real difference between them, yet his phraseology is not so well adapted to convey distinct ideas of papal supremacy to those who have not had some previous familiarity with the subject.

Now the first evidence relied on to prove his doctrine, as you may remember, was that of Scripture, chiefly consisting of the language of the text. And I showed, as I trust sufficiently, that the Roman exposition of the passage was not consistent with the nature of the metaphor, nor with the other

* Church of Rome, 19, &c.

evidence of the divine record: that Peter was indeed a foundation-stone in the spiritual edifice of the Church, but that Christ was the Rock on which the whole Church could alone be founded: that the privileges promised to Peter were afterwards promised to the other apostles, although not actually conferred upon any of them until the resurrection of Christ: that the personal ministry of our Lord, and also of his apostles up to this period, was confined to the Jews, and that it was necessary to offer up the great sacrifice of atonement for the whole world, before the Gospel could consistently be extended to the Gentiles: that the commission actually conferred by the Redeemer just before his ascension into heaven, was the only fulfilment of the promise which he had made before to Peter, and to the other apostles: that this commission was not given in one form to Peter and in another form to the rest, but was a joint authority, given alike to all without the slightest distinction; and that the subsequent history of the acts of the apostles, and the epistles as well of Peter as of Paul, clearly show, that they did not accord to him, nor did he claim, the smallest superiority over them. And having thus gone carefully and largely into the Scriptural evidence, we deferred until the present occasion the examination of the fathers, in which we shall find a strong corroboration of the views which have been set before you.

Let us then, brethren, proceed to the hearing of these primitive witnesses and interpreters of Scripture, and thus obtain the opinion of those to whom the Church of Rome so confidently appeals. Before commencing our examination, however, it may be as well to mention a few matters, necessary to be borne in mind, in order that we may properly appreciate the nature and importance of this kind of testimony. In the first place, then, let it be observed, that the earliest or oldest writers are always the best witnesses of facts belonging to the apostolic age, because they lived nearest to the times when the facts occurred, while those who come after them cannot have

an equal opportunity to test the truth or falsehood of their allegations. And as, amongst the writers called the fathers, we have the names of eminent men who lived in different centuries, we must carefully distinguish between their evidence on this very ground; always remembering that the earliest witnesses must be the most trustworthy, not because of their greater integrity, but because the apostolic doctrine must needs have been best known to those who lived nearest to the apostolic day.

Let me next call to your recollection the statement of Dr. Wiseman, that, in order to establish the doctrine of Roman supremacy, they are bound to show, first, that Peter was made the ruler over the other apostles and the whole Church; next, that he established himself as the bishop of Rome; and lastly, that he left his prerogatives to his successors, who, by virtue of his rights, are to be acknowledged as the vicegerents of Christ himself throughout the world.

Now the testimony of the fathers after the 4th century may be cited on both sides of the argument, which very diversity proves that the doctrine itself was not established even at that period. But we shall prove to you, that however the later fathers may be found to vary from each other, the earlier fathers do all, for the first four hundred years of the Christian era, testify distinctly against the present doctrine of the Church of Rome, and the greater part interpret the proof-texts on which the doctrine of the papacy relies, not according to the Roman explanation of them, but according to our own.

Having premised these general observations, I proceed to the proof adduced from certain chosen witnesses of our author, and will commence with those passages on which he professes to place his chief dependence.

He begins by quoting Irenæus, the bishop of Lyons, who lived in the next generation after the apostle John, to prove the episcopate of St. Peter and the superior spiritual headship of

the Church of Rome; although, in truth, the evidence proves neither the one nor the other. It is as follows: "As it would be tedious," saith Irenæus, "to enumerate the whole list of successors, I shall confine myself to that of Rome, the greatest, and most ancient, and most illustrious Church, founded by the glorious apostles Peter and Paul, receiving from them her doctrine, which was announced to all men, and which through the succession of her bishops, is come down to us. To this Church, on account of its stronger principality, every other Church must resort, that is, the faithful round about from every quarter. They, therefore, having founded and instructed this Church, committed the episcopal administration thereof to *Linus*, to him succeeded *Anacletus*, then in the third place *Clement*, to *Clement* succeeded *Evaristus*, to him *Alexander*, and then *Sixtus*, who was followed by *Telesphorus*, *Hyginus*, *Pius*, and *Anicetus*. But *Soter* having succeeded *Anicetus*, *Eleutherius*, the twelfth from the apostles, now governs the Church." (p. 232.)

This passage is one of the most valuable remnants of antiquity, greatly relied upon by the Church of Rome, and triumphantly repeated by all her writers: and yet, when carefully and accurately examined, I have no hesitation in saying that it is utterly hostile to their claims. Let me ask your attention, brethren, to a brief analysis of the case, as presented by this, their own chosen witness.

First then, the Church of Rome asserts, that St. Peter was bishop of Rome for twenty-five years, and left his prerogative to his successor. But Irenæus says that this Church was founded by St. Peter and St. Paul, and that they committed the episcopal government of it to *Linus*. Now observe, here, that Irenæus not only says nothing of Peter's being the first bishop himself, but states what is totally inconsistent with such a supposition. For the Church of Rome allows that there cannot be two bishops at once in the same city or in the same

diocese; and therefore, since Irenæus expressly declares that both Peter and Paul founded the Church of Rome, and committed the episcopal charge of it to Linus, thereby uniting the two apostles in the whole work, it results manifestly, either that they *both* acted as the bishops of Rome; which, by their own rule, is impossible; or that they acted in the matter, not as *bishops*, but as *apostles*, which is indeed the truth. But if this be the truth of Irenæus' testimony, it establishes our position, that neither Peter nor Paul was the first bishop of Rome, but *Linus*; and this fact alone is fatal to the claims of papal supremacy, since it places its whole argument upon the assumption that St. Peter was the first bishop of Rome, and that the popes are his successors.

In the next place, the greatness of the Church of Rome is here spoken of by Irenæus in strong terms; and he tells us that the whole Church, that is, the faithful from every quarter, must resort to that Church, on account of its stronger *principality*. Now our ingenious advocate for papal supremacy would have us suppose, that the principality here mentioned is the pre-eminence which Rome enjoyed by reason of her having been the see or bishoprick of Peter, who was the prince of the apostles. But our witness, Irenæus, says no such thing. The word principality is not, as we all know, a term which properly belongs to the authority of Churches, or the government of bishops. A bishop is an overseer, not a prince, in the true meaning of his office. And the circle of his jurisdiction is a diocese, not a principality. Therefore we perceive that the *stronger principality* which, according to Irenæus, gave pre-eminence to the Church of Rome in the second century, was a superiority derived from the *prince*, and not from the *bishop*. Rome was then the political mistress of the world, because it was the seat of the imperial government. In it was the royal palace of the Cesars, and the capitol from which the decrees of the senate went forth throughout the globe. Within its

walls were concentrated all the wealth, the learning, the ambition, the pleasures, and the interests of millions. It was at once the head and the heart of the most mighty empire on which the sun had ever shone, and the Church established there, must, for these reasons, have attracted the eyes of all Christendom. The faithful resorted to it from every quarter, as their duties, their curiosity or their connexions led them to visit the vast metropolis, and it must have been the richest, the greatest, and the most influential of all the Churches, through the political and earthly principality of its location.

Thus understood, the language of Irenæus is clear and consistent; but were we to adopt the hypothesis of Roman supremacy founded upon the episcopate and pre-eminent prerogatives of Peter, we should find it contradictory and unaccountable. For if this primitive witness believed as they imagine, why did he not say that Peter established himself as the first bishop of Rome, instead of saying that Peter and Paul founded that Church jointly, and delivered the episcopal government to Linus? And in the other part of the passage, why does he not say that the faithful from every quarter must necessarily resort to the Church of Rome, on account of its having been the diocese of Peter, instead of saying on account of its stronger principality? When fairly examined, therefore, brethren, we see distinctly that Irenæus does not only omit what the doctrine of the Church of Rome requires, but actually sets down what cannot be fairly reconciled with it.

We are happy in possessing another passage of the works of Irenæus, however, which places the subject in a still stronger light. There was a controversy in his time about the proper day for keeping the festival of our Lord's resurrection; the eastern Churches universally observing it on one day, and the western Churches on another. Victor, the bishop of Rome, being desirous to bring about a general consent upon the subject, found the eastern bishops unwilling to change their

rule, and thereupon undertook to pronounce against them a sentence of excommunication. The consequence was, that the other bishops of the west censured him severely, and amongst the rest, Irenæus, who was the bishop of Lyons, wrote him a letter of expostulation, of which the following is a part:

“These bishops,” saith Irenæus, addressing himself to Victor, “who formerly governed the Church of Rome over which you now preside, neither observed the eastern custom about the feast of Easter themselves, nor allowed those who were with them to observe it. And yet they preserved peace with those Churches in which it was observed. And when the blessed Polycarp (bishop of Smyrna) came to Rome in the time of Anicetus, (who was then the Roman bishop) there was a little controversy between them upon other matters as well as this, and yet they embraced each other with the kiss of peace, not being disposed to contend any further about the question. For Anicetus could not persuade Polycarp to change his custom, because he had lived familiarly with the apostle John, the disciple of our Lord, and with the other apostles, and observed their rule continually. Nor, on the other hand, could Polycarp persuade Anicetus to conform, because he said that he retained the custom of the elders who were before him. Under these circumstances, they communed together. And Anicetus, the Roman bishop, yielded to Polycarp, as a token of respect, the office of consecrating the Eucharist in the Church; after which they departed from each other in peace, each retaining, in mutual allowance, their former custom.”

Now here, brethren, we have, not a few words of uncertain and controverted meaning, but a plain historical fact, which clearly demonstrates the equal rights of the primitive bishops, and utterly destroys the foundation of Roman supremacy. Irenæus, the bishop of Lyons, rebukes Victor, the bishop of

Rome, for breaking the peace of the Church by excommunicating the eastern Churches. This shows us two points of great importance. First, it shows how early the notion of dominion over the other Churches began to be manifest in the bishops who occupied the great metropolis of the world. And secondly, it shows us, that at this time the other bishops had no idea of suffering such an assumption, but, on the contrary, highly disapproved the arrogance and pride of the Roman pontiff. We see, in the next place, that Irenæus relates to Victor the condition of the Churches in the generation which had just passed over them; when the very same controversy arose between the celebrated bishop of Smyrna, who had been the scholar of St. John, and Anicetus, the then Roman bishop. He states expressly that neither would yield to the other, because each considered himself justified by the custom of the apostles; and yet so far was the Roman bishop from pretending to any supremacy over the bishop of Smyrna, that he gave him the post of honour in his own Church, and parted from him in peace and charity. Where was then the doctrine of Peter being the prince of the apostles, the pope holding the place of Christ upon the earth, the Church of Rome being the mother and mistress of all the Churches, the bishop of Rome being the fountain of all authority and the centre of unity? Ah, brethren! these were the comparatively pure days of simplicity, and apostolic truth and order. All bishops were equal, all held a perfect parity of rights and privileges, as the apostles had done before them. In this interesting narrative, therefore, we have what may well be called an historical demonstration, that the vast prerogative of Roman supremacy had no real sanction in the will of Christ, nor in the doctrine of the apostles, nor in the practice of the primitive Church, but was the result of power and policy at a much later day.

Thus much may suffice for the testimony of Dr. Wise-

man's oldest witness among the fathers. Let us pass on to the evidence of the next, Tertullian, who flourished within thirty or forty years after Irenæus. Our ingenious author quotes a sentence here, in which Tertullian, telling Christians to settle their controversies by applying to the nearest apostolic Church, saith, "If you are in Africa, Rome is not far, to which we can readily apply. Happy Church! to which the apostles gave their whole doctrine with their blood." Now you will perceive at once, brethren, that this, although it seems to flow well enough in the general channel of Dr. Wiseman's argument, in reality proves nothing to the purpose. Let me quote a little more from the same witness, and you will have a far more complete view of his testimony.

"Come then," saith Tertullian, "you who wish to exercise your curiosity to good advantage in the concerns of your salvation, go through the apostolic Churches, amongst which the very seats of the apostles continue in their places and their original epistles are recited, sounding forth the voice and representing the countenance of each one. Is Achaia near to you? You have Corinth. If you are not far from Macedonia, you have Philippi, you have Thessalonica. If you cannot go throughout Asia, you have Ephesus. But if you are convenient to Italy, you have Rome, whence authority for us is nigh at hand. How happy is this Church to which the apostles gave their whole doctrine with their blood." Here, brethren, you have the introductory passage, together with the part on which our learned advocate relies; and you see how vain must be the attempt to draw from it any proof of supremacy or superior dominion for the Church or pope of Rome. For Tertullian refers the Christian to all the apostolical Churches, evidently placing them on an equality: He mentions first, Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, which were of St. Paul's planting. Then he mentions Ephesus, which was of St. John's planting. He mentions Rome last, and says that her authority

is nigh at hand, because he lived at Carthage, which was not very distant from Rome. And when he calls her, Happy Church! instead of giving the reason which would suit Dr. Wiseman's hypothesis, namely, because Rome was the diocese of the apostle Peter, and on that account was appointed to be the mother and mistress of all the other Churches, and to have her bishop exalted to the seat of absolute supremacy as the vicegerent of Christ—instead of all this, our witness simply refers to the circumstance, that at Rome the apostles Peter and Paul had suffered martyrdom, and therefore had not only given to this Church their doctrine, but also their blood. That this was an interesting fact to the Church of Rome may be readily admitted, but it is obvious that it was one which had nothing whatever to do with the question of government or supremacy.

There is another part of Tertullian's testimony, however, which is more express than this, showing the rise of the subsequent doctrine relative to priestly absolution, and arguing against it in terms which clearly prove that he was no advocate for the supremacy of Peter, and still less for the derivation of that supremacy to the bishops of Rome.

“From your own argument,” saith he, “I would know from whence you derive this right (of absolution) which you claim for the Church. If from our Lord's saying to Peter; Upon this rock I will build my Church: To you I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven, or, Whatsoever you shall bind or loose on earth, shall be bound or loosed in heaven; do you therefore presume that this power of binding and loosing descended to thee, that is, to the whole Church which is related to Peter? If so, you are overturning and changing the manifest intention of our Lord, who conferred this on Peter individually. *Upon thee*, he says, I will build my Church; and *to thee* I will give the keys, not to the Church; and whatsoever *thou* shalt loose or bind, not whatsoever they shall

loose or bind. So likewise the event teaches us. On him the Church was built, that is, *through him*: he furnished the key; behold what key. 'Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man destined for you by God,' and so on," (alluding to the first sermon preached by St. Peter on the day of Pentecost). "He too," continues Tertullian, "first, in the baptism of Christ," (administered on that same day to three thousand Jews, and afterwards to Cornelius, being the first example among the Gentiles) "unlocked the gate of the celestial kingdom—and he bound Ananias with the chain of death, and he loosed the impotent man from his lameness. Likewise in that dispute which occurred about keeping the Mosaic law, Peter, first, being filled with the Spirit, foretold the calling of the Gentiles. The decree which followed both loosed the things of the law which were omitted, and bound those which were retained."—"What now," concludes Tertullian, "has all this to do with the Church, and especially with yours, O thou carnal man? According to the person of Peter, this power will suit spiritual men, such as an apostle or a prophet. For the Church properly and principally is the temple of that Spirit in whom is the Trinity of one Deity, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. When thus constituted, the Church may forgive offences; but this is the Church in which is the Spirit by spiritual men, not the Church which is the number of bishops. For this is the prerogative and will of the Master, not of the servant; of God himself, and not of the priest."

This, brethren, is a long quotation, but I think you will agree with me in considering it a most interesting relic of antiquity. I do not mean to touch the question at present, whether Tertullian's doctrine as to the power of the keys was right or wrong; this is no proper occasion for that investigation, which will call for its own appropriate argument in due season. But as a witness brought before us by the Church of Rome, for the express purpose of sustaining her claims as the

mother and mistress of all other Churches, and the claim of her bishop as the vicegerent of Christ, and supreme ruler over the whole territory of Christendom, I consider it only just to hear all that he has to say upon the point in question.

Observe then, brethren, that according to Tertullian, the privilege of absolution granted to Peter was confined to Peter, and to such as he was, an apostle and a prophet, or at the least, if there be any descent of this prerogative to the Church: it must, says he, be a Church in which the Spirit speaks in spiritual men, and not the Church composed simply of the number of bishops. Secondly, Tertullian explains the power of the keys granted to Peter, to have been the spiritual faculty of preaching the Gospel, conferring baptism, pronouncing censures of authority, such as that on Ananias and Sapphira, &c., without one word of supremacy or superior dominion over the rest of the apostles or the whole Church. In both of which, this witness of Dr. Wiseman is directly opposed to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and furnishes positive evidence against the apostolic derivation of their system.

The third witness to whom our author appeals is Cyprian, the famous bishop of Carthage, who, about fifty years later than Tertullian, writing against the attempts of certain schismatics to disturb the Church of Rome by unlawfully setting up another person instead of Cornelius, their bishop, used this language: "Having chosen a bishop for themselves, they dare to carry letters from schismatics and profane men to the chair of Peter and to the principal Church whence the sacerdotal unity took its rise, not reflecting that the members of that Church are Romans, whose faith was praised by Paul, to whom perfidy can have no access."

Now here we have, certainly, a beginning of the doctrine of the Church of Rome, showing to us what we anticipated when examining the evidence of Irenæus, namely, how early the bishops of Rome endeavoured to secure dominion and su-

premacv. The influence of their efforts, too, we find first showing itself in the neighbourhood of Rome, for Carthage, where Cyprian was bishop, lay within a moderate distance from the imperial city. Let it be granted, then, that in the year 250, about a century and a half later than Polycarp, a century later than Irenæus, and fifty years later than Tertullian, the doctrine was partially admitted that Peter had been bishop of Rome, and that the unity of the Church took its rise in the see or diocese of Peter. But this you will find, brethren, carries us but a very small way towards the point of the pope's supremacy; and a little further examination of this very witness will show that he believed no more in that supremacy than I do.

To understand the views of this distinguished father, it will be necessary to make several other extracts, and to take some little time for the purpose of combining them together; but the result, I may venture to say, will be distinct and satisfactory. He thus states his general system:—

“As there is only one Church of Christ,” saith Cyprian, “divided into many members throughout the whole world, in like manner there is but one episcopate, diffused by the harmonious host of many bishops; and this, according to the tradition of God, is the connected unity of the Catholic Church.”

Again, “the episcopate,” saith he, “is *one*, of which a part is held by each bishop, with an interest in the whole. The Church also is one, which is extended more widely by the increase of its fecundity; in like manner there are many rays of the sun, but one light; and many branches of the tree, but one strength founded in the firm root: and though many rivulets flow from one fountain, and although the number of these streams is diffused in the extent of overflowing abundance, nevertheless unity is preserved in the origin.”

Thus far then, brethren, we may see, that while Cyprian agreed to the proposition that the promise made to St. Peter

was the commencement of episcopal unity, and that Peter occupied the episcopal chair of Rome, which for that reason he calls the seat of Peter, from which the sacerdotal unity took its rise; yet he maintained that the bishops were every where equal, like the rays from the sun, and the branches from the tree, and the streams from the fountain. "The episcopate being *one*, of which a part is held by each bishop, with an interest in the whole." Assuredly these comparisons could never have been chosen by Cyprian, if he had held the Roman doctrine of papal supremacy; for here he undertakes to set forth the very part of Christianity, which would have imperatively obliged him to mention the powers of the chief ruler, the vicerent of Christ, had such a monarchy as the pope asserts formed any part of his system.

To prove this, however, with the strongest evidence, we must ask your attention to a few other passages. The greater part of the works of Cyprian consists of letters addressed by him to the bishops and clergy. Many of these are written to the bishops of Rome, and in all of them the appellations given to the Roman bishop are perfectly fraternal and unceremonious, indicative of the doctrine of entire equality, but totally inconsistent with the form afterwards established in the papal monarchy. For this is his invariable style of address: *My colleague, my fellow bishop, my brother*; but he never adds any title of superior respect or deference.

Again, Cyprian assigns the reason why Rome takes precedence of Carthage, and here he must surely have referred to the papal doctrine of supremacy, if that doctrine had been approved in his day. But instead of this, he puts it entirely on the ground of the secular or temporal superiority of Rome, as the metropolis of the world, according to the principle which I have already explained. His words are these: "Plainly, therefore, on account of its magnitude, Rome ought to precede Carthage."

But nothing tries the question of comparative authority so conclusively, as the occurrence of a dispute or controversy. And here we have the irresistible evidence of the real state of Church government in the days of Cyprian.

The case was as follows: Stephen, the bishop of Rome, next but one after Cornelius, maintained that the administration of baptism by the hands of heretics and schismatics, was valid, notwithstanding the heresy and schism of the administrators; and therefore, that when persons so baptized came to desire admission into the Catholic Church, they should not be re-baptized, but be received with the imposition of hands and prayer, upon an open acknowledgment of their error. Cyprian, the primitive witness whose testimony is before us, together with Firmilian, the bishop of Cappadocia, and all the bishops of Africa, warmly opposed the doctrine of the Roman bishop; insisted that such baptisms were altogether void and worthless, and that the persons thus applying for admission amongst the orthodox or Catholic Church, must first receive baptism in the Church, since their former baptism was, in effect, no real baptism, but merely, as they called it, a "staining with profane water." It may perhaps be proper to state, that the doctrine of Stephen was, long afterwards, established by a general council, so that Cyprian and his colleagues did not prove to have had the right side of the controversy; and this serves to demonstrate, the more clearly, the exercise of their independence in the matter.

Now you remember, brethren, that nearly a century before the time of Cyprian, Victor, the then bishop of Rome, presumed to excommunicate the eastern bishops, because they would not change their custom about the festival of Easter, for which he was universally censured and reproved. But here was a much more serious question, touching the validity of one of the sacraments, and occurring at a period when the Church of Rome had made some little beginning towards her subse-

quent dominion. It is obvious that the contest, under such circumstances, must call out the whole strength of the Roman claims, and that in the discussion of it we should be able clearly to ascertain how far those claims had advanced and were acknowledged. The result was, that Cyprian and his colleagues asserted their independence and maintained their ground, although the bishop of Rome, notwithstanding the failure of his predecessor Victor, had again tried the force of his ecclesiastical excommunication.

Now, had the doctrine of the Church at that time been the same with the subsequent system of papal supremacy, one of these two results must have followed the resistance of Cyprian. Either he and his African colleagues must have submitted to the bishop of Rome, or they must have been cut off as obstinate schismatics. But neither of these results were apprehended, nor did either take place. Cyprian did not submit, but severely censured Stephen for his tyrannical course, and continued to deny the truth of the Roman tradition. And yet so far was he from being condemned for his independence, that he stands upon the Roman Calendar as a saint, and is termed the blessed Cyprian by their canon law. Nothing could more clearly demonstrate the strenuous efforts of the bishops of Rome for supreme dominion on the one hand, and the perfect independence of the bishops in Cyprian's day upon the other.

I proceed to verify this statement, brethren, by the words of Dr. Wiseman's own witness.

The epistle written by Cyprian and his colleagues, after the first council of Carthage, to Stephen, bishop of Rome, furnishes our first authority.

“In order to correct and dispose certain matters,” saith he, “by common consent, we found it necessary, most dear brother, to collect together many bishops, and celebrate a council. In which various points were proposed and decided; but that about which we chiefly desired to confer with your gravity

and wisdom, and which concerns most nearly the authority of the priesthood, and the unity and honour of the Catholic Church, was the subject of those who are baptized without the Church, stained with profane water amongst heretics and schismatics. When such as these come to us and to the Church, which is one, we judged it fit that they should be baptized, because we think it little worth to give them the imposition of hands for the reception of the Holy Spirit, unless they have first received the baptism of the Church." After this introduction, Cyprian proceeds to explain his doctrine at large, and then concludes as follows:

"These things we have addressed to your conscience, dearest brother, for the common honour and for sincere love—but we know that certain men are unwilling to lay aside any opinion which they have once expressed, and while the bond of peace and concord among their colleagues is preserved, they continue to retain their own sentiments. In which matter we neither give law nor offer violence to any one. *Since every bishop exercises the free choice of his own will in the administration of the Church, having to render an account of his acts to the Lord.*"

Here, then, you have the plain doctrine of Cyprian addressed to the bishop of Rome himself, in which you perceive how he alludes to the opposite opinion of Stephen, and points out the proper course to be taken, namely, that if he would not be convinced of his error, he should keep the peace of the Church, and follow his own plan within his own jurisdiction. And the concluding sentence is particularly strong, because Cyprian there lays down the great rule of the episcopate to the bishop of Rome himself, that every bishop exercised his own free choice in the administration of the Church within his district, being accountable to God alone. Where was the doctrine of the subjection of the other apostles to Peter, and the consequent subjection of all other bishops to the pope, when this epistle

was written? Where was the article of the faith, as Dr. Wiseman would call it, that the Church of Rome is the mother and mistress of all the Churches, that the pope is the fountain of all authority, and occupies the place of Christ himself upon the earth? Plainly, brethren, there could have been no such notion established in the days of Cyprian.

But we add a few extracts from the fathers, written after Stephen had rashly and tyrannically endeavoured to excommunicate Cyprian and his colleagues. Thus, for example, Firmilian, the bishop of Cappadocia, addresses Cyprian upon the subject: "Those who are of Rome," saith he, "do not in all things observe what was delivered from the beginning, and they pretend, but vainly, to have the authority of the apostles. Every one knows, that with respect to the day for keeping Easter and many other rites of religion, there are diversities among them, nor do they observe all those things which are observed at Jerusalem. The same diversity may be seen in many of the provinces. Many things are varied through the changes of times and language, and yet there is no departure on this account from the peace and unity of the Catholic Church. But Stephen, the bishop of Rome, has presumed to disturb this concord and unity, breaking towards you the peace which his predecessors always maintained, and defaming the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, as if they had delivered his doctrines."

In another epistle of Cyprian to one of his African colleagues on the same subject, he says: "Since you have desired, most dear brother, to know what our brother Stephen returned in answer to our letter, I have sent you a copy of his reply, in which you see more and more his error, in endeavouring to sustain the cause of heretics against the Church of God. Many are the proud and irrelevant things,—many the contradictions, which he has unskilfully and thoughtlessly written.

How great is this obstinacy, how bold this presumption, to place human tradition before the divine authority.”*

We have now closed the evidence of Dr. Wiseman’s third witness, brethren; and I trust you have no difficulty in perceiving, thus far, how perfectly the testimony of the fathers substantiates our doctrine, against the modern creed of the Church of Rome. But I am not willing to rest this part of our evidence upon the few names which he has selected from the earlier writers; and therefore I must trespass a little longer, in order to show, that the texts of Scripture on which the doctrine of Roman supremacy is supposed to rest, were interpreted by the primitive Church in the same manner that we have already set before you.

Origen, a celebrated cotemporary with Cyprian, but belonging to another region of the Church, gives the following commentary on the address of our Lord to Peter. “If we also shall say, as Peter did: Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, not as if it had been revealed to us by flesh and blood, but by the light shining in our hearts from the Father which is in heaven, we shall become as Peter, and it may be said by the Word unto us also: Thou art Peter; with what follows. For every disciple of Christ is a rock from whom they drank who drank of the spiritual rock that followed them, and on every such rock every ecclesiastical word is builded, and the system of life instituted accordingly; and on every such perfect man, having the combination of precepts perfecting holiness, the Church is inwardly built by God. But if you suppose that the Church is built by the Lord upon Peter only,” continues Origen, “what do you say of John, the son of thunder, and every one of the other apostles? Or shall we say that the gates of hell were not to prevail specially against Peter? Were they then to prevail against the other apostles

* See the author’s “Church of Rome,” for the original.

and perfect believers?—Or was it to Peter alone that the Lord gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and did none other of the blessed receive them? But if this passage be common to the others: I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, it is manifest that those things which precede it, and are evidently connected with it, must be common also.”

“We see by all this,” continues Origen, a little farther on, “how it may be said to Peter, and to every one who resembles Peter, I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. For these words are to be taken in connexion with the passage: The gates of hell shall not prevail against it; since he who is defended against the gates of hell, so that they prevail not against him, is worthy to receive from the divine Word himself the keys of the kingdom of heaven as a reward—that he might open to himself those gates which are shut to all others. And thus the key of chastity admits him into the gate of chastity, and the key of righteousness into the gate of righteousness, and so of the other virtues.—For each virtue may be a kingdom of heaven; and the whole together is the kingdom of the heavens, so that he who lives according to these virtues is already in the kingdom of the heavens. For Christ, who is all virtue, declares that the kingdom of heaven is not here or there, but is within us.”

One extract more, brethren, will suffice, from this most interesting witness of primitive antiquity. “There are some,” saith he, “who interpret this passage of the episcopacy as being represented by Peter, and they suppose that by the keys of the kingdom of heaven received from the Saviour, those things which are bound by them on earth are bound also in heaven, and those which are loosed on earth, are loosed also in heaven. And it must be confessed that they say truly, if they have the quality on account of which it was said to Peter, Thou art Peter, and if they are such that upon them the Church can be built, and this privilege can be justly granted to them.

But the gates of hell ought not to prevail against him who would bind and loose; for if he is bound by the cords of his sins, he binds and looses in vain. Therefore, if any one be not what Peter was, nor possessed of those qualities which have been described, and yet thinks that he, like Peter, can bind and loose upon the earth, so that his judgment shall be confirmed in heaven, that man is proud, not knowing the sense of the Scriptures, and being lifted up with pride he falls into the snare of the devil.”*

Surely, brethren, it is impossible to ask for language more plain than this, to prove that the doctrine of papal supremacy had not reached the ears of Origen, although, as Dr. Wiseman elsewhere declares, (p. 116,) “he was one of the most learned men who existed in the early ages of Christianity, and of the most philosophical mind.” He treats the text in a professed commentary on the Gospels; he speaks of the notion of some, who applied it, as Cyprian did, to the episcopacy at large; but he seems utterly unconscious that it had ever been distorted into such a form as to sustain Peter’s government over the other apostles, much less the government of the bishop of Rome over the whole Church, as the vicegerent of Christ upon earth, endued with the plenitude of power.

But our limits are nearly exhausted, and therefore I must hasten briefly over the other testimonies of the fathers, having space only for a few out of many which I had noted for insertion.

Eusebius, the learned bishop of Cesarea, was the author of an ecclesiastical history of the first 320 years of the Christian era. In this work he expressly declares, with Irenæus, that Linus, and not St. Peter, was the first bishop of Rome; but of the doctrine of supremacy he says not one word, while his whole book furnishes the most conclusive circumstantial evi-

* Church of Rome, &c.

dence against it. This kind of evidence, however, is too tedious for an occasion like the present, and therefore I pass it by.*

Let us next hear Ambrose, the celebrated bishop of Milan, who flourished about the end of the fourth century, when the influence of Rome had made some progress towards the achievement of her subsequent conquests over the liberties of the Churches. Yet notwithstanding this fact, and notwithstanding his contiguity to Rome, we shall find his testimony valuable. Thus, speaking of the interpretation of the text, Ambrose saith, "*Faith is the foundation of the Church*, for it was not said of the flesh of Peter but of his faith, that the gates of hell should not prevail against it, but the confession of faith overcame hell."

Again, this witness saith, addressing himself to Christians generally: "Believe as Peter believed, that you also may be blessed, that you may deserve to hear: *Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee*, but my Father which is in heaven. For whosoever overcomes the flesh, is a foundation of the Church. If he cannot equal Peter, he can imitate him; for the gifts of God are great, since he has not only repaired in us what is ours, but has even vouchsafed to grant us what is his own."

Again, "The rock," says Ambrose, "is Christ, for they drank of that spiritual rock which followed them, and that rock was Christ. And he has not denied to his disciple even the favour of this word, that he also may be a Peter, because from the rock he derives the solidity of perseverance and the firmness of faith. Strive, therefore, that thou mayest also be a rock. And look for that rock not without thee, but within. The rock is thine action, the rock is thy mind. Upon that rock thy house is built, that it may be struck by no spiritual wickedness. The rock is thy faith: faith is the foundation of the Church."

The mode in which Ambrose speaks of the apostles, shows him to be an advocate for the equality of their office, and

* Church of Rome.

therefore no believer in the supremacy of Peter, and of the pope of Rome. Thus in one place he saith, "To thee, said our Lord, I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that thou mayest loose and bind. Novatian did not hear this, but the Church of God heard it. What is said to Peter is said to all the apostles."

Again, "For as Peter, James and John seemed to be pillars of the Church, so also whoever shall overcome the world becomes a pillar of God."

And again: "Paul was not inferior to Peter," saith Ambrose, "although the one was a foundation of the Church, and the other a wise master builder. Nor was Paul unworthy of the apostolic college, since he also may be compared with the first, and was second to none. For he who does not acknowledge himself inferior, makes himself equal."*

From the testimony of Ambrose, I turn to another witness, who is also one of Dr. Wiseman's own choice, the famous and learned Jerome. In his epistle to Evagrius, he thus speaks of the comparative authority of the Churches and the bishops. "The Church of Rome," saith he, "is not to be thought one thing, and that of the whole world another. Gaul and Britain, and Africa and Persia, and the East, and Judea, and all the barbarian nations, adore also one Christ, and observe the same rule of truth. If authority is sought for, the world is greater than one city. Wherever there is a bishop, whether at Rome, or Eugubium, or Constantinople, or Rhegium, or Alexandria, or Tanis, he is of the same excellency, of the same episcopate. The power of wealth and the lowliness of poverty does not make a bishop either less or greater. But they are all the successors of the apostles."

Again: "You say," saith Jerome, "that the Church is founded on Peter, although the same thing is elsewhere done

* Church of Rome.

upon all the apostles, and all received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, so that the strength of the Church is consolidated upon them all alike."

That Jerome interpreted the text as we have done, is abundantly certain. Thus, in his commentary on the very passage, he saith, "On this rock the Lord founded his Church; from this rock the apostle Peter obtained his name." Again: "The foundation which the apostle, as an architect, laid, is one, our Lord Jesus Christ. Upon this foundation the Church is built."*

The great Augustin, bishop of Hippo in Africa, must close this hasty sketch of the fathers' testimony; and you will find, brethren, that his interpretation of the chosen texts of our Roman advocate is particularly clear and decisive.

"The Lord," saith this eminent father, "declared, 'Upon this rock I will build my Church,' because Peter had said, 'Thou art Christ the Son of the living God.' Upon this rock, therefore, which thou hast confessed, I will build my Church. For *the rock was Christ*, upon which foundation Peter himself also was built. For another foundation can no man lay, besides that which has been laid, Christ Jesus. The Church therefore, which is built on Christ, received the keys of the kingdom of heaven in Peter, that is, the power of binding and loosing sins."

Again, saith this eminent master in Israel, "What does this saying mean: Upon this rock I will build my Church? Upon this FAITH, upon that which was spoken: *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.*"

Upon the other text in St. John's Gospel, where the apostle Peter is told by our Lord to feed his sheep, the same great teacher saith as follows: "Feed my sheep, I commit my sheep to thee. What sheep? Those which I have bought with my blood. I have died for them. Dost thou love me? Die thou

* Church of Rome.

for them also. And truly, brethren," continues Augustin, "Peter gave his blood for them. But that which was committed to Peter, that which he was commanded to do, not Peter only but likewise *all the apostles, heard, held and kept.*—They heard these things, and transmitted them to us that we might hear them. We feed, therefore, and are fed with you. May God give us strength in such wise to love you, that we also may be enabled to die for you, either in fact or in affection."*

But here, brethren, I must close this slight enumeration of the primitive witnesses, to which the advocates of the Church of Rome, confiding I presume in our ignorance, are always in the habit of appealing with apparent triumph, when nothing can be more certain than the fact, that their testimony, fairly and thoroughly examined, is decidedly adverse to the Roman doctrine. We have yet to lay before you the history of the actual rise and progress of the papal dominion, the height to which it had attained before the Reformation, its influence upon the kingdoms of Europe, its subsequent reduction to its modern form, and the varieties of construction now existing with regard to its true extent and character; all of which we shall endeavour to bring within the compass of the next lecture. Meanwhile, we may find it profitable to suggest a few reflections, which naturally arise from the subject before us.

— And first, let us take from it a lesson on the selfish tendencies of human nature, which even amongst the holiest and the best of men, are so apt to lead to corruption. The efforts of the primitive bishops of Rome, to accumulate power—their desire to attach the supremacy of the Roman government to the rights of the Roman Church—their ingenuity in fastening a forced and erroneous meaning upon Scripture to support their pretensions; and the evident commencement of their unfounded claims, although but a commencement, even in

* Church of Rome.

that early period, when the Church was still groaning under the iron rod of persecution—all this shows us, as in a faithful mirror, the infirmities of poor human nature; and the ease with which the demon of ambitious self-aggrandizement, can appear to be an angel of light. And yet many of these men were unquestionably eminent for piety and zeal; nor do I doubt their sincerity in believing that their supremacy over the Church, if once established, would tend powerfully to preserve it in unity and peace. But they erred in imagining that any human invention could be a real improvement upon the system of God, established by the inspired apostles; and therefore they stand as a warning to the Church not to place confidence in man, however exalted in station or eminent in character. There is nothing infallible, but the Word of God.

In the second place, my brethren, we may here learn a lesson of admiring confidence in the Providence of the Almighty Ruler, that the very writings of the primitive fathers should be handed down to us by the Church of Rome herself, not indeed in their perfect integrity and purity, for many of their own writers acknowledge that they have been grievously interpolated, but yet so far genuine, as to afford us the clearest proof of the state of the primitive Church, and the most satisfactory evidence that its original government was altogether changed into a totally opposite system; the vast republic of the Catholic Church (see Laud's Conf. with Fisher, 166) converted into a stupendous monarchy—the various dioceses with their bishops, once equal and independent, debased into inferior jurisdictions, subject to the arbitrary dominion of a single head—so that no two things bearing the same name can be more different, than the free and moderate episcopacy of the time of Cyprian, and the despotism which afterwards superseded it in the supremacy of the pope of Rome. True indeed it is, that these writings of the fathers afford abundant material in support of the Roman doctrines, after the first four cen-

turies passed away. True likewise, that an ingenious application of certain passages in the earlier fathers can be made to look like Romanism, as you have doubtless perceived, my brethren, in the course of these lectures. But we have great reason to be thankful, that a thorough examination of these primitive witnesses will be rewarded by so much that is pure and Scriptural; and that in this way, the very authorities to which the Church of Rome appeals in support of error, can be made tributary to the establishment of truth.

Lastly, we should surely rejoice in the especial goodness and mercy of God, that after centuries of darkness and delusion, our forefathers were enabled to regain so happily the faithful likeness of the ancient Church of Christ, and perpetuate it in the leading doctrines, government, and worship of the Church of England. For you perceive, beloved brethren, that every examination we make into the authority of Scripture, the great rule of faith, and into the interpretations and practice of primitive Christianity, only serves to corroborate, more and more, the truth and correctness of her religious principles. Those principles, freed from every political admixture, have descended to us, and form the most precious part of the many privileges derived from our father-land. May we cherish the doctrines thus inherited, with increasing devotion. May we, in our turn, hold up the lamp of sacred instruction, to all who need its blessed light. May we watch over our own ways, under the humbling conviction, that our responsibility before Christ must be in proportion to our advantages; and earnestly seek that grace, through which alone we can hope that our labour will not be in vain. And may we live to see the day, when the Church of Rome, which we desire to love notwithstanding all her errors, shall adopt the writings of those fathers which she professes to venerate, and find her way back again to the primitive pattern of apostolic truth and order.

LECTURE VIII.

JOHN, xviii. 36.—Jesus answered; my kingdom is not of this world.

OUR two last discourses, my brethren, were occupied by that cardinal doctrine of the Church of Rome, which asserts the supremacy of the pope, as the vicegerent of Christ himself, the head of the whole Church, at once the centre of unity and the fountain of authority; and makes this proposition an article of faith, necessary to every man's salvation. The first of these two lectures was devoted to the examination of the Scriptural evidence, on which the advocates of Roman supremacy rely; and the second, to the testimony of the earlier fathers. We proved, as I trust, conclusively, that the claims of this universal monarchy over the Church universal, were contrary to the plain and repeated testimonies of the sacred volume; and further, that the texts to which its advocates were accustomed to appeal, were interpreted by the fathers, not according to the Roman doctrine, but according to our own. We stated that the first germ of the papacy was indeed to be found very early, in the history of the attempts made by the bishops of Rome to govern the other bishops with a high hand. We showed that their pretensions grew out of the superior wealth and influence of the great metropolis, ancient Rome, which was, at the time when Christianity found a place within it, and for several centuries afterwards, the acknowledged mistress city of the world. And we promised, in the present lecture, to set forth the rise, progress and extent of the papal dominion,

prior to the Reformation, and the condition in which it stands at the present day. To these topics I shall now invite your attention, and shall state those facts only which the unquestionable authorities of the Church of Rome herself will fully justify. You will then be enabled to see the striking contrast between the doctrine of the papacy, and the declaration of our blessed Saviour in the text, which I have set down in the words of the Roman Catholic version, called the Doway Bible: "Jesus answered, *my kingdom is not of this world.*" For you will behold the pope claiming a kingdom over the whole earth, wielding his authority over all other monarchs, not only becoming a temporal prince in his own dominions, but bringing every other European sovereign in homage to his feet.

To show the progress of this extraordinary history the more clearly, I shall state first, the condition of papal power between the beginning of the 4th and the 8th century; secondly, its condition from the 8th to the 16th century, which was the period of the Reformation; and thirdly, its condition from that time to the present: all of which will be important to those who desire to estimate correctly the character of this fundamental article of the Roman Catholic faith.

At the time when Constantine the great became a convert to Christianity, which was about the year of our Lord 312, the Roman empire might be said to embrace the whole civilized world. In its political division, it included several extensive districts, which were then called dioceses, and the emperor conformed the government of the Church to the same limits. The chief political ruler of each of these large dioceses was called *Exarch*, and the chief ecclesiastical ruler was *the Patriarch*. Every patriarchate contained several provinces, and the chief bishop of a province was called the metropolitan. Every province contained several parishes, or, as we now call them, dioceses, over each of which a bishop presided, under whom were the inferior clergy. Amongst all these there was a regu-

lar system of subordination, gradually rising from the lowest ecclesiastic to the patriarch. But amongst the patriarchs there was no subordination, for all were equally supreme. The only distinction among them was the order of honour, or precedence, derived from the customary respect paid to their respective sees; and the highest honour was naturally and properly accorded to the patriarch of Rome, because Rome was the imperial residence, the mistress city of the whole.

This condition of the government of the Church, brethren, as you will at once perceive, was partly of apostolic and partly of human authority. The original three orders of the ministry, the bishops, priests, and deacons, continued to be the only orders acknowledged universally as of indispensable obligation. To these the Church by degrees appended others. The subdeacon, the reader, the door-keeper, the acolyth, were below the order of deacon, and were designed to assist in the various offices of the house of God. The archdeacon, and archpriest or dean, were posts of distinction among the deacons and priests, calculated to aid the bishop in the discharge of his duties; and the metropolitan or archbishop, and the patriarch, were distinctions amongst the bishops themselves, intended to be useful auxiliaries in the work of government. All these, however, were of simply human device, and the higher ranks proved, in the end, liable not only to the abuses which pollute even the ordinances of God when ministered by man's infirmity, but to those peculiar dangers of ambition and pride, which belong, more or less, to every scheme of mortal invention, in the arduous and tempting field of authority and power.

It was not long after his conversion to Christianity, before the emperor Constantine formed the plan of transferring his imperial residence to that celebrated city which bears his name, Constantinople. Raised by the immense treasures which he had at his command, to a surpassing height of grandeur, and made the seat of one of the great patriarchates, it

was soon recognized as the rival of Rome, and contended, with various success, for absolute superiority. The Church was, at this time, grievously troubled by heresies. At no period, indeed, was she perfectly free from them, but they assumed a far greater magnitude when the religion of the Gospel became adopted by the State; because the zealous liberality of the emperor, and the ignorant ardour of the patrician host, held out to every ingenious innovator the hope of patronage from the great, and support from the powerful. Hence the calling of General Councils, to debate upon and settle the true Christian faith, became necessary. Some smaller Councils we read of previously, such as those of Carthage in the time of Cyprian. But the collecting of large Councils, in which the bishops should come together from distant parts, and continue long in session, required the action of the government: and we find, accordingly, that the first extensive assemblage of that kind was summoned at Arles by Constantine, and the first General Council which was held at Nice, in Bithynia, on the subject of the Arian heresy, was stated by the emperor himself, in his speech to the Council, to have been his own plan, as it certainly could only have been brought about by his own authority.*

You are all aware, brethren, of the well known historical fact, that before the close of the century which saw Christianity established, the vast empire of Rome was divided into two parts, the eastern and the western. Constantinople was the seat of the eastern, and for the most part, Ravenna, and not old Rome, became the seat of the western; so that the absence of the emperor naturally threw more and more influence and power into the hands of the popes, or bishops of Rome. It was almost equally a matter of course, that in the holding of Councils, the eastern branch of the Church should take the

* Church of Rome.

lead in the east, and the western in the west ; so that the two great patriarchates of Rome and Constantinople, by degrees, divided the whole power of the Church between them. But the scale of their respective claims inclined more and more in favour of the popes, because the east was torn and distracted by dissensions in the fundamental points of faith, such as the Trinity, and the nature and person of Christ. While Rome, maintaining these steadfastly, as she does to this day, gained that increasing measure of confidence, which firmness and consistency never fail to secure, when contrasted with anarchy and confusion.

I have not space, nor would it be interesting, to dwell on the various turns of history between the division of the empire, and the second period marked as the time of Charlemagne, or Charles the great. The irruptions of the barbarians, the extinction of the western empire, the passage of the Roman sceptre to the east, the establishment for a time of the kingdom of the Lombards in Italy, were all events of importance. But in reference to our particular subject, the power of receiving appeals, granted to the pope by the emperors Valentinian in the west, and Marcian in the east, was a more important step towards the papal dominion, than any other event belonging to this part of history. The elevation of the murderer and tyrant Phocas to the imperial throne, in the sixth century, was also made tributary to the honour of the Roman Church, inasmuch as this emperor granted to the pope the title of universal bishop. The dreadful dissensions of the east about the worship of images in the seventh century, still further tended to increase his influence and power ; but we pass over these, in order to mark the temporal glory and substantial territory acquired in the eighth century, which forms the second era of the papal supremacy.

The story is as follows: The kingdom of the Franks was under the feeble government of the last descendant of Clovis,

the weak Childeric; while all the real prerogatives of royalty were exercised by Pepin, the mayor of the palace. The nobles, as well as himself, were bound by the ties of allegiance to their phantom of a king; and they applied to pope Zachary to know how far they might lawfully have these ties dissolved, so as to place Pepin on the throne. The pope decided, that under such circumstances, Childeric might be deposed and sent to a monastery; and that Pepin, who already had the power, might assume the name of king. Accordingly, Pepin and his adherents gladly received the accommodating decision, and on the strength of the pope's high authority, the revolution was at once effected.

Rome was at this time in peril from the Lombards, who possessed what was called the kingdom of Italy, and had often assaulted and ravaged the ancient city. On the application of the pope, Pepin came to its succour, forced Astolphus, the Lombard, to resign his prey, and in his gratitude to the Roman pontiff for affording him a plausible title to the throne of France, he made a donation of the exarchate to the pope and his successors, as the patrimony of St. Peter. This donation was enlarged and confirmed by his son, Charles the great; who retained it, nevertheless, under his jurisdiction and protection with the title of patrician and patron: and thus the former ecclesiastical possession of farms and houses, (Gibbon, v. 92) was transformed into cities and provinces, and the pope became the wearer of a princely crown, notwithstanding we are told that he is the vicar of Him who said, "My kingdom is not of this world."

The successful conqueror who thus became the strongest earthly support of the papal supremacy—since, in sustaining the papacy, he was justifying his own right to the throne of France—was soon afterwards declared emperor of the Romans by pope Leo III. and publicly crowned in the Church of St. Peter. And thus Rome was finally detached from the

eastern empire, and a distinct western empire was formally established by the sword of Charlemagne, and the policy of the pope. (Gib. v. 102.) It is easy to see how an example which resulted so prosperously in the case of Pepin and his son, would be adopted by other sovereigns in the difficulties of the European states, and how the papal authority to dispose of crowns and sceptres, which formed the basis of the most powerful empire of the age, would become a standing prerogative of the papacy, allowed by the following ages, and openly defended by popes and kings, as their various interests might best incline them.

There was still, however, one defect in the papal monarchy, which lasted long after the time of Charles the great, namely, that the election of the popes was not complete, until it was approved by the emperor. And this badge of subjection continued for nearly two centuries later, when pope Gregory VII. succeeded, after many years of conflict, in settling the foundations on which the whole papal system has ever since been built, and on which it is still maintained, not indeed by the general admission of Roman Catholics in Germany, France, and Great Britain, but assuredly by the popes themselves, who are, according to the acknowledged doctrine of their Church, *the only proper judges of the question.*

This brings us, brethren, to the third period, that of the Reformation; since which there has been manifested, throughout the Church of Rome, in all the countries I have mentioned, a strong disposition to deny the temporal part of the papal prerogative, namely, that which warrants the pope to depose sovereigns, grant kingdoms, and be the supreme arbiter of all human governments, throughout the globe. The first systematic attack upon this prerogative was made in A. D. 1682, by the famous Declaration of the French Clergy, in the reign of Louis the XIV. Since which, almost all their modern controversialists, when writing for the eyes of Protestants, and Dr.

Wiseman amongst the rest, agree to make light of it, as being the product of the middle ages—not the doctrine of the Church of Rome at all, but merely the well-meant imposition of the popes themselves, to check the warlike temper of European potentates in feudal times, by obliging them to respect some superior power. And thus has been revived a more moderate doctrine, which was *attempted* to be established in the century before the Reformation, by the Councils of Florence and Basle, viz: that the pope is inferior to a General Council, and that the infallibility of the Church is not placed in the office of the pope, but in the decisions of the Church at large. Now these doctrines do indeed detract immensely from the powers which the popes had openly claimed and exercised for more than five hundred years together: but neither of them, I am sorry to say, have yet been sanctioned by the only tribunal competent to settle the controversy, since they have never been adopted by the popes themselves, and in their last Council of Trent, the whole subject was passed over.

Having thus, brethren, set before you a brief history of this remarkable and important article of the Roman creed, I proceed to state my evidence, which you will find to be far stronger than my language has been. And in this evidence you will bear in mind that I quote from those books only which the Church of Rome has produced, and therefore is bound to admit as good authority.

I commence with the famous *Dictates*, as they are called, of Pope Gregory VII., extracted from the collection of the Councils, published by the Roman Catholics of France, and edited by the Jesuit Hardouin; and I beg your particular attention to them, as being the fundamental maxims of the papacy, from the beginning of the 11th century, that is, in its modern form. (Hard. Con. 6 vol. part 1, p. 1304.)

“1. *That the Roman Pontiff alone is lawfully called the Universal Bishop.*

2. *That he alone can depose or reconcile the other bishops.*
3. *That his legate takes precedence of all bishops in council, and may pronounce sentence against them.*
4. *That the Pope can depose those who are absent.*
5. *That no one ought even to remain in the same house with any person excommunicated by the Pope.*
6. *That to him alone it belongs, in cases of exigency, to make new laws, to congregare new people, to divide a rich bishoprick, or to unite poor ones.*
7. *That he alone can use the ensigns of imperial government.*
8. *That all princes should kiss the feet of the Pope only.*
9. *That his name only shall be recited in the Churches.*
10. *That his name is alone, throughout the world.*
11. *That it is lawful for him to depose emperors.*
12. *That it is lawful for him to transfer bishops from diocese to diocese.*
13. *That he may ordain any one in any Church he thinks fit.*
14. *That no council ought to be called general, without his order.*
15. *That no chapter, nor any book, be esteemed canonical without his authority.*
16. *That his sentence can be withdrawn or reversed by no one, and that he himself alone has authority to make such retractation.*
17. *That he cannot be judged by any.*
18. *That no one should dare to condemn the Apostolic See.*
19. *That the weightier questions should be referred to him, by every Church.*
20. *That the Roman Church never has erred, and according to the testimony of Scripture, it never will err.*
21. *That the Roman Pontiff, if he has been canonically*

ordained, is beyond doubt made holy by the merits of blessed Peter.

22. *That no man shall be held for catholic, who does not agree with the Church of Rome.*

23. *That the Pope can absolve the subjects of wicked princes from their allegiance."*

Now here, brethren, we have a code of the most absolute despotism, and yet nothing more than what fairly exhibits the practical administration of the papacy for many ages, and what, as I shall presently prove, has never been relinquished to this day. To show, however, in what manner it was actually carried out, I must ask your attention to some passages from the papal history.

Henry IV., who was emperor of Germany and king of the Romans at the time of pope Gregory's election, and who had confirmed it, refused to give up the right of investing his own bishops, and the pope excommunicated him accordingly. The effects of this papal sentence were so serious, in compelling his friends and subjects to withdraw from him, that he found himself obliged to seek a reconciliation with the incensed pontiff, and came to Italy, having previously tried in vain to procure his absolution, by messengers and presents. Now the following passage is extracted from the letter of the pope himself, addressed to the German subjects of the emperor, and giving an account of Gregory's own course upon this remarkable occasion. "The king came," says the pope, "with a very few attendants, to the city of Canusium, where I was at that time residing, and there he presented himself before the gate for three entire days, in a wretched condition: all his royal apparel being laid aside, clothed in woollen, and barefoot, he ceased not to implore, with much weeping, the aid and consolation of our apostolic mercy, so that all those who were present, and to whom the report came, were moved with pity and compassion; and interceding for him with many

tears and prayers, were astonished at our unusual hardness of heart, crying out, that we did not exhibit so much the gravity of apostolic judgment, as the cruelty of tyrannical ferocity. At length we yielded, being overcome by his compunction and the supplication of the rest, and the chain of our anathema being loosed, we re-admitted him into the bosom of the holy mother Church, having first received from him the following security." Here, brethren, we have an oath set forth on the part of king Henry, which I add in full, because it sheds much light on the character of the whole transaction. (Hard. Conc. 6 vol. 1 part, p. 1355.)

"The oath of Henry,"

King of the Germans.

"I, Henry the king, promise, with respect to the murmurs and dissension, which the archbishops and bishops, the dukes, counts, and the other princes of the Germans, now have against me, that I will pursue the course which my lord pope Gregory shall lay down, that I will seek justice according to his judgment, and concord according to his counsel, unless some impediment shall prevent either myself or him, which impediment, being removed, I will be ready to perform the same. Likewise, if the same lord pope Gregory shall desire to pass beyond the mountains, or to go to any other part of the world, he shall be secure on my part from all injury of life and limb, or captivity, and also those who shall accompany him, and those whom he shall send, or those who shall be going to him from any part of the world; and this security shall be for the time of their going, remaining and returning: nor shall any hinderance be given them by my consent, which may be contrary to his honour. And should any other attempt his injury, I promise to help him with all my power."

This is the whole, brethren, of king Henry's oath or security; turning, you perceive, solely upon the disputed question of internal government, extending to the point of personal

assistance, but not having one line in it which refers to the Gospel, or to the spiritual discipline, which could alone serve even as a pretext for the pope's severity.

In the progress of the history, however, it appears, that although the king submitted, he did not remain long satisfied, and therefore took up arms against the pope, to vindicate what he claimed to be his right in the investiture of the bishops, notwithstanding the want of the pope's sanction. After the war had lasted for some time, we meet with another oath which the pope tendered to Henry, as the condition of peace. It is as follows :

“From this hour and thenceforward, I will be faithful with good faith to the blessed apostle Peter and to his vicar pope Gregory, who is now living. And whatsoever the pope himself shall command me under these words, *By true obedience*, I will faithfully observe, as it becomes a Christian. But with regard to the ordinances of the Churches, and the lands or the tribute which Constantine the emperor, or Charles, have given to St. Peter, and of all the buildings and property which at any time have been given by men or women to the holy see, and which are or shall be in my power, I will so agree with the pope that I shall not incur the danger of sacrilege and the perdition of my soul. And I will render all due honour and service to God and to holy Peter, Christ helping me; and on that day when I shall first see the pope, I will faithfully, by my own hands, become the soldier of St. Peter and himself.”

Here again, we have a most emphatic assertion of the character of the pope's dominion: his spiritual excommunication being used to promote his temporal interests, and the strengthening of his earthly kingdom being always a prominent object of the exacted submission.

The sentence of king Henry's deposition, and the transfer of his empire to duke Rudolph, which the pope delivered in full council at Rome, will close our citations from his testi-

mony. (Hard. Con. Vol. 6, part 1, p. 1590.) And you will observe that Gregory, throughout the whole of this extraordinary document, addresses himself to the apostles Peter and Paul, instead of to the Deity. The language is as follows:

“O blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, and thou blessed Paul, teacher of the nations, vouchsafe, I pray you, to incline your ears to me, and hear me graciously. Since you are the disciples and lovers of truth, help me that I may speak the truth to you, that my brethren may the better acquiesce in my judgment, and that they may know and understand how in your trust and confidence, after the Lord and his ever virgin mother Mary, I resist the evil and the wicked, and render help to all who are faithful to you.” In the same strain the pope proceeds, relating king Henry’s disobedience and duke Rudolph’s merits to St. Peter and St. Paul, at considerable length, and thus he concludes, still addressing the apostles as before. “On which account, confident in the judgment and mercy of God, and of his most pious mother the ever virgin Mary, and endowed with your authority, I subject to excommunication, and bind with the chains of the curse, the aforesaid Henry, whom they call king, and all his abettors; and on the part of the omnipotent God, and on your part, (blessed Peter and Paul) I interdict to him the kingdom of Germany and Italy, and take away from him all royal dignity and power, and I forbid every Christian to obey him as a king, and I absolve from their oath of allegiance all who have promised or shall promise obedience to him. And I declare that the said Henry and his abettors shall have no strength for the war, and that in his life-time he shall gain no victory. And, further, I give, grant and agree, on the part of your faithfulness (O blessed St. Peter and St. Paul) that Rudolph, whom the Germans have elected for their king, shall rule and govern the kingdom of Germany: and to all who shall faithfully adhere to him, I, relying on your support, do grant the absolution of all their sins, and your

blessing in this life, and in the life to come. For as Henry, for his pride, disobedience and deception, is justly deposed from the royal dignity, so do we grant to Rudolph the same dignity, for his humility, obedience and truth."

"I pray you, therefore, O most holy apostles, fathers and princes, that all the world may understand and know, that, as you are able to bind and loose in heaven, you are also able upon the earth to take away and to grant, according to their respective merits, empires and kingdoms, principalities and dukedoms, marches and counties, and the possessions of all men. For oft-times you have taken away patriarchates, primacies, archbishopricks, and dioceses, from the wicked and unworthy, and have given them to the faithful and the pious. If, therefore, you can judge spiritual dominions, how much is it to believe that you can do the same with temporal: and if you shall judge the angels who govern all proud princes, what can you not do to their servants? Let kings now learn and all the princes of the world, how great you are, O blessed Peter and Paul, how much you can perform, and let them fear to make light of the commands of your Church: and especially inflict your judgment on the aforesaid Henry so speedily, that all may know his fall to be by your power, and not by chance. May he be confounded to repentance, that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord."

Here, brethren, is a document, extracted from the records of the Church of Rome, and translated as closely as possible, which exhibits fully and fairly what very few amongst Roman Catholics themselves are aware of, in the comparatively moderate notions promulgated about the pope's authority at the present day. The case is the more worthy of notice, because it was the first example of the kind; although the claims of the popes had been, for a long period before, gradually coming up to the mark of this stupendous dominion. And being the first, it is no wonder that it was not acquiesced in. So far from it

indeed, that it produced a long and bloody war, gave rise to the parties of the Guelphs and Ghibellines, and desolated the land for more than a century. It is further interesting, because it is so strongly characterized by the superstition of that age, namely, the 11th century, than which perhaps none have been darker. The pope addresses himself to St. Peter and St. Paul, he calls himself their vicar, he relies on their power in heaven and on earth, he pronounces his anathema not only against the king, but against the thousands of his unknown subjects who might, however innocently and loyally, adhere to him. And with equal liberality, he pledges the absolution of all their sins, together with the blessing of the apostles here and hereafter, to all who should sustain Rudolph, without concerning himself about their having any other good quality whatever: so that nothing can give a clearer idea of the system of the papacy, with its attendant despotism, superstition and servility, in the days of this most distinguished and successful conqueror over the liberties of Christendom.

Not quite two centuries elapsed after this example of Gregory, when we find pope Celestine III. exhibiting his supremacy in an improved style towards another Henry, the 5th of the name, and also emperor of Germany; who, with his empress Constantia, came to receive their crown at the hands of the pope, after the reconciliation of a quarrel between them. The manner in which the pontiff performed this duty is thus narrated by the Roman historian Baronius. "Our lord the pope was seated," saith the historian, (An. Baron. Tom. 12, p. 841,) "in the pontifical chair, holding the golden crown of the empire between his feet, and the emperor, bending down his head, received the crown, and the empress in like manner, from the feet of our lord the pope. But our lord the pope immediately struck the emperor's crown with his foot, and threw him on the floor, in order to signify, that he had the power to cast him from the empire if he should prove unde-

serving. And then the cardinals, picking up the crown, placed it upon the head of the emperor." This insulting freak would induce one to suppose, that the pope must have been one of those young and undisciplined persons, who were, in some instances, strangely elected to that high dignity. But the fact is that Celestine, who thus obliged an emperor and an empress to receive their crowns from his feet, and then kicked off the imperial diadem, and overset the wearer, was eighty-five years old (*ib.* p. 839, § 1,) at the time of his consecration. These instances are only specimens out of a large list of cases, where the power of the pope is placed high above that of every earthly potentate.

We shall have no difficulty, with these facts before us, brethren, to be prepared for the broad principle laid down in the great council of Lateran, summoned by pope Innocent III., and consisting of more than 1200 bishops, in which it was declared, (*Philpot's Letters to Butler*, I. 275,) that "the secular powers should be admonished, and if necessary, be compelled by ecclesiastical censures, to make oath that they will, to the utmost of their power, strive to *exterminate* from their territory *all heretics* declared to be such by the Church; and further, that if any temporal lord, being required and admonished by the Church, shall neglect to purge his territory from all taint of heresy, he shall be excommunicated by the metropolitans and other provincial bishops, and if he contemptuously omit to give satisfaction within a year, it shall be signified to the holy pontiff, in order that he may thenceforth proclaim his vassals absolved from fealty to him, and may expose to catholics his territory to be occupied by them, who, having exterminated the heretics, may possess the same without contradiction." Here, brethren, we have the same tremendous supremacy asserted by the largest council that ever met together, and openly connected with the principle of persecution in its worst form.

Our next evidence shall be from an epistle of this pope Innocent III. to the eastern emperor of his day, where we read as follows: "You ought to have known the prerogative of the priesthood from its being said by God, not to a king but to a priest, not to one descended from royal, but priestly parentage: See! I have set thee up over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root up and to pull down, and to destroy and to throw down, to build and to plant. Besides you ought to know, that God made two lights in the firmament of heaven, the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night—both great, but one greater. In the firmament of heaven, therefore, that is, of the Universal Church, God made two great lights—that is, instituted two great dignities, which are, the authority of the pope and the power of kings. But that which rules over the day, that is, in spiritual things, is the greater; and that which rules over carnal things, is the lesser. So that the difference between pontiffs and kings may be understood to be as great as between the sun and the moon." (Philpot's Letters to Butler, I. 279.) This was the pontiff, brethren, whose name was rendered so famous in English history by his triumph over the contemptible king John. But Otho, one emperor, and Frederick, another, were treated by him with quite as little ceremony.

Again, saith the Roman canon law, on the authority of pope Boniface VIII., (ib. p. 278.) "All the faithful of Christ are of necessity of salvation under the Roman pontiff, who has both swords, and judges all men, but is judged by none. We are instructed by the Gospel, that in the power of the pope there are TWO SWORDS, the spiritual and the temporal. The one to be used *for* the Church, the other *by* it—the one by the priest, the other by the hand of kings and soldiers, *but at the nod and sufferance of the priest*. But one sword ought to be under the other, and the temporal authority to be subjected to the spiritual. Finally, we declare, say, define, and pronounce,

that *it is of necessity of salvation to every creature, to be subject to the Roman pontiff.*"

But enough, and perhaps more than enough of evidence, brethren, has been exhibited, to prove the enormous height and unparalleled power of the papal dominion, as it was set forth and practised over all Europe from the end of the 10th to the 16th century, which brings us to the era of the Reformation. The remaining branch of our proof is in relation to the question, whether the popes have really resigned their pretensions since that time, as Dr. Wiseman, and every other Roman Catholic advocate, in Great Britain and the United States especially, profess to believe. And on this part of the case, facts are the best ground for argument.

In the year 1570, some time after the Reformation, pope Pius V. published his sentence of excommunication against queen Elizabeth, and endeavoured to excite her subjects to revolt, and deprive her of her kingdom. Subsequently to this, Pope Sixtus V. renewed the attempt by a solemn bull, in which he styles Elizabeth an usurper, a heretic, and an excommunicate, gives her throne to Philip II. of Spain, and commands the English to join the Spaniards in dethroning her. Every reader of history knows that this act of the pope produced the Spanish invasion, at which time their famous armada was totally destroyed, and their whole object defeated; so that this tyrannical effort of the pope to break down the English Church, only established it more firmly than before. (Philpot's Supplement, p. 475.) The same pope proceeded in the same way against Henry king of Navarre, the prince of Condé, and all their adherents; pronouncing them heretics, declaring their dominions and estates forfeited, absolving their subjects from their allegiance, and charging them not to obey their princes under pain of the greater excommunication.

The famous declaration of the French clergy already referred to, which is currently stated to be now the standard doctrine, and in which the power of the pope in temporal matters is wholly denied, was passed in the year 1682. But it was condemned by pope Innocent XI., and afterwards by Alexander VIII.; and all the power of Napoleon Bonaparte could not prevail on pope Pius VII. to acknowledge its doctrine, even when a prisoner at Savona, so late as the year 1811, only thirty-two years ago. It is certain, besides, that both the French bishops and the king himself, who were concerned in framing that declaration, were obliged to apologize to the then pope, before he would consent to the institution of the divines, whom the monarch had named to fill the vacant bishoprics; (ib p. 478.) so that it is evident there was no amelioration of the former despotic claim, so far as the popes were concerned.

But not to consume time with other instances, let us come to those later examples which have occurred within our own day. In A. D. 1800, pope Pius VII. addressed Louis XVIII. as lawful king of France, and made to him, *as such*, the usual communication of his election to the papacy. In the following year, on 10th April, 1801, the same pope entered into a *Concordat* with Bonaparte, which instrument not only suppressed, at one stroke, one hundred and forty-six episcopal and metropolitan sees, and dismissed their bishops without form or trial, but also absolved all Frenchmen from their oaths of allegiance to their sovereign, Louis XVIII., and authorized an oath of allegiance to the First Consul. (See Philpot's Letters to Butler, quoting Butler's own authority for the above, p. 302.)

And in A. D. 1809, the same pope issued his bull, excommunicating and anathematizing the same Napoleon Bonaparte, and all who adhered to him in the invasion of the papal dominions. The language of this bull is worthy of especial notice. It is as follows: "Let our persecutors then," says the pope, "learn once for all, that the law of Jesus Christ has

subjected them to *our authority and to our throne*. For we also *bear the sceptre*, and we can say that our power is far superior to theirs,—already have so many sovereign pontiffs been forced to proceed to similar extremities against rebellious princes and kings, and shall we be afraid to follow their example?" (ib.) Here then, brethren, we behold a direct claim of the *temporal sword*, and a positive application of its use, within our own recollection, in the midst of the boasted illumination of the nineteenth century; clearly demonstrating, that whatever the advocates of the Church of Rome may think it expedient to say about the matter, the prerogatives of the pope are held as high as ever they were, in Rome itself; and the popes are as ready to exercise them, if the temper of the age would bear it.

A few words upon the ceremonies of the pope's installation may be desirable, as shedding light upon the proper character of this important doctrine, and these shall be extracted from a standard work upon the subject. "The pope, after his election, is adored three times. First, in the chapel where the election is held, the dean of the cardinals, and after him the other cardinals, adore him on their knees, kiss his foot, and then his right hand. The second time he is placed on the altar in the chapel of Sixtus, where the cardinals come and adore him in the same manner. And again, the pope is carried in his pontifical chair under a grand canopy of red, fringed with gold, to the Church of St. Peter, where he is placed upon the grand altar, and the cardinals adore him for the third time, and after them, the ambassadors of princes."

"At his coronation, he is seated on his throne, and an anthem is sung, the words of which are the prophecy of the Psalmist relative to Christ: "Thou shalt set a crown of pure gold upon his head." The second cardinal deacon takes the mitre from him, and the first puts the tiara on his head, saying: Receive this tiara which is adorned with three crowns, and forget not,

in wearing it, that you are the father of princes and of kings, the *ruler of the world, and on earth the vicar of Jesus Christ our Saviour.*" It may be observed, by the way, that the pope, in wearing three crowns, whereas all other monarchs wear but one, is supposed to refer to his three kinds of sovereignty. The first, over his own dominions; the second, over the kings and princes of the whole earth; and the third, over the Church. The first instance of the pope wearing any crown was in the case of Damasus II. in A. D. 1048, and the three crowns were not adopted till the time of Urban V. The treasures employed in this extraordinary display may be imagined from the fact, that the value of the tiara worn by pope Clement VIII. was estimated at 500,000 pieces of gold, equal to several millions of dollars. (Ch. of Rome, 384, &c.) The splendour and costly magnificence of this ritual, however, in itself, would be of small importance. It is when it stands connected with the claims of the pope to be the vicar of Christ, the father of kings and princes, the ruler of the world, the dispenser of thrones, the absolver of oaths of allegiance, the breaker-down and builder-up of governments, whose feet must be kissed by those who approach him, who is placed upon the altar of God and adored by the cardinals upon their knees, who is the dispenser of pardon, and grace, and benediction, so that it is of necessity of salvation to every creature to be subject to him,—it is in connexion with these marvellous, stupendous claims, that the ceremonies of his coronation are interesting, because we thus see the consistency of the whole mass of superhuman powers which the superstition of the dark ages has heaped upon the Roman pontiff, and are the better enabled to estimate the infallibility, the unchangeableness, the concord and the purity, which the Church of Rome would fain persuade us are all her own.

Let us then, beloved brethren, in conclusion, sum up the topics of these last three lectures, by showing you their bearing

not only on the principle of Roman infallibility, but also on the general proposition, that the Reformation has exerted a powerful influence, even on the Church of Rome herself.

1. We have seen the equality of the apostles, the equality of the primitive bishops, and the total absence of any thing that looked like a temporal dominion. Now I would ask, if the Church of Rome were incapable of erring, why did she not continue in her primitive simplicity? Why did she avail herself of the ignorance of those barbarian nations which she converted to the faith, by teaching them to add to that faith an acknowledgment of the pope's dignity and power, such as was utterly unknown for more than six centuries of the Christian era? But again, if the Church of Rome was from the beginning, as they say, tenacious of the apostolic system, I ask, how is it that we find her bishop become a mighty sovereign, keeping kings standing barefoot for three days before his castle gate, compelling emperors and empresses to receive their crowns from his feet, and making the proudest monarchs tremble before him? For how can any man believe that this was the system of the apostles? Can any one be persuaded that such was the administration of that Saviour, who said, "My kingdom is not of this world?" And can it be questioned, for a moment, that an abuse so flagrant as this, even if there had been no other, did of itself call loudly for the work of reformation?

2. But we have also seen the contrast between the claims of the popes since the period of the Reformation, and the doctrine of their bishops and their clergy. Two successive popes excommunicated queen Elizabeth, and absolved her subjects from their allegiance, and one of them commanded those subjects to join the king of Spain. But no one in Great Britain obeyed them. These very powers were openly denied by the king and clergy of France, and the pontiff was obliged to be content with an evasive apology. The pope absolved the French

nation from their allegiance to Louis XVIII. in favour of Napoleon, then he excommunicated him in turn, and in neither case was the slightest effect produced by acts, which prior to the Reformation, would have kindled a civil war in any part of Europe. Behold, then, brethren, a specimen of the unity and concord of which our Roman brethren boast so confidently. The head commands, and the members disobey. The vicar of Christ exercises his old prerogatives, and his own people do not mind him. And Dr. Wiseman himself, after beholding and rejoicing over the magnificent coronation of the pope, and echoing the proclamation which styles him the father of kings and the ruler of the world, goes over to England, and gravely assures his auditory, that the temporal exercise of papal sovereignty is no longer a part of the Roman Catholic system.

3. But lastly, what shall we say to the candour and the frank dealing of those, who, like Dr. Wiseman, undertake to declare the real doctrines of the Roman Church to the world? How are we to account for their repeating continually that they are *unchanged*, and *unchangeable*, and all united in sentiment, when the plainest historical evidence, furnished by the popes themselves, stands openly against them? How shall we explain this strange contradiction: the popes saying one thing, the bishops and the priests saying the very opposite, and yet both agreeing to keep the peace? It is said by many, that this is done for the purpose of regaining their lost influence and power, by an accommodation of their doctrines to the temper of the age, until they feel strong enough to enforce their former dominion. It is supposed that the popes renew their claims from time to time, for the sake of *consistency*; and that the priests are suffered to teach the very contrary for the sake of *policy*, until the nations who have burst their chains are again bound with them, and the rulers of states and kingdoms shall again be compelled to bow before the universal monarch of the triple crown. For myself, brethren, unwilling

as I should be to impeach the candour of any man, I must acknowledge that it is difficult to account for the strange anomaly on any other hypothesis. For the facts are undeniable, and must lead to one of these conclusions. Either the unity of the Church of Rome in this fundamental point exists no longer, or the popes and the priesthood must have a secret understanding, which resolves this open diversity into the necessity for a temporary disguise. Doubtless, they imagine it to be all right, and think their despotism quite preferable to our freedom. But for us, who desire to judge according to the only infallible standard, the written Word of God, the counsel of the great apostle should be our guide: "Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage."

The subject allotted to our next lecture, and which is directly connected with the present, is the principle of anathema and persecution, which is unhappily engrafted upon the Church of Rome as an article of faith, and which perhaps, more than any thing else, renders her power an object of fearful apprehension to the rest of the Christian world. This subject shall be treated as fairly and as kindly as possible, brethren, because it is no part of my desire to present painful facts, any farther than they are *necessary* for the understanding of *established principles*. My object is to set before you the *doctrines* of the Church of Rome, not the vices, the cruelties, or the enormities, which may have been exhibited by individuals amongst her priesthood or her people. And therefore, as, in the present lecture, I have been silent on the point of the lives of certain popes, so, in the next, I shall not promise to enter, needlessly, into the details of the inquisition, or any other variety of mode in which the coercion or punishment of heretics was attempted. Believing, in my conscience, that the principles of the Reformation, particularly as established in the English branch, are the pure and essential principles of Christianity, and regarding the

Church of Rome with none but the kindest feelings, it has long been my heart's desire and prayer for them, that they might understand and forsake the errors of their system. I have no sympathy with those who wish to see that Church destroyed, or oppressed, or treated in any way unjustly: God forbid! for it is of apostolic origin, it continued long pure in faith, and it still retains the fundamental doctrines of the true Christian creed, notwithstanding its manifold corruptions. But I would help them, if I could, to discover the perilous changes, which the love of priestly power, and the superstitions of the darker ages, brought in upon them; and I should rejoice with joy unspeakable, if I might be permitted to behold the day, which should bring them and every other part of Christendom, within the blessed circle of primitive unity, according to the pure standard of the Gospel of peace. But although I may not live to see so happy a consummation, may the Lord hasten it in his own good time, and to his great and ever blessed name, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be all the glory.

LECTURE IX.

ROM. xii. 14.—Bless and curse not.

SUCH, my brethren, was the solemn injunction of the great apostle of the Gentiles to the Church of Rome: an injunction so characteristic of that Gospel which is the message of peace and good will to men, and so plainly in accordance with the sacred mission of that Redeemer who was the Prince of peace, that there is nothing in the entire circle of her errors which seems to me more awfully inconsistent with the Word and Spirit of God, than her open and declared opposition to it. I speak not of the acts of her pontiffs, her bishops, or her people; but I speak of the *principle* which she has incorporated into her very creed, as an ARTICLE OF FAITH, by which the solemn pronouncing of a curse, in the form of anathema, against all who refuse to adopt her whole system, is made the duty of every soul belonging to her. In direct connexion with this, stands the doctrine of persecution and extirpation of heretics, so long practised by the Church of Rome, and enjoined as a work of the highest merit. And to the same principle, only a little farther extended, we are obliged to trace the horrible institution of the Inquisition. For although this has been abolished within the last thirty years—nay, although many deny that it could ever have been justly charged upon the Church of Rome, yet we shall find it to have been the positive work of her pontiffs, adopted and cherished by multitudes of her priesthood, so that the question will remain to be decided:

Who are the best authorities for the real doctrine of the Roman Church—the popes, and the whole of Italy, Spain, and Portugal, including, at one period, a portion of France herself; or the modern Roman Catholics of France, Germany, and Great Britain? But be this point settled as it may, one fact must be established by every fair examination of the subject: namely, that religious intolerance is the genius of the Roman Catholic Church, while toleration has been purely, under God, the work of the reformers.

In order, however, that we may discern how far the principle of persecution has been engrafted on the creed of the Church of Rome, and how much of it remains at the present day, I shall begin by considering the anathema, or solemn curse, denounced upon heretics by the creed of pope Pius IV., which is the acknowledged creed of all Roman Catholics without exception.

Secondly, I shall explain the proper meaning of the term anathema, as practically understood by the Church of Rome, and the extent and mode to which it has been applied by the Council of Trent.

Thirdly, I shall set forth some of the acts of popes and councils, in procuring what they called a holy war upon heretics, in order to destroy them by open violence.

Fourthly, I shall present a sketch of the rise, progress and authority of the Inquisition, which was intended to extirpate heretics by process of law, just as the holy wars were intended to extirpate them by the sword.

And lastly, I shall state the present position of the whole doctrine.

I need scarcely say, my brethren, that no subject belonging to the Roman controversy is more painful, and none needs to be handled with greater caution and fairness than this: while, on the other hand, there is nothing of which a thorough understanding is more vitally important to the peace and secu-

rity of Christendom. The Roman Catholics themselves are as deeply interested in this matter as any other body of professing Christians whatever; because they are scattered all over the world, and live under a variety of governments, the rulers of which, although Christians, by no means agree with them in religious sentiment. Hence it is notorious, that in many parts of Switzerland and Germany, in Prussia, Denmark, and Sweden, in the East and West Indies, in England, Ireland, and Scotland, in the province of Canada, and in the United States, the members of the Church of Rome are indebted for all their Christian liberty to the doctrine of TOLERATION. But if toleration amongst Christians be right, persecution must be wrong; and the argument which belongs to the discussion of the point is of such deep practical importance, that all should be ready to lay aside their prejudices and passions, in order to examine it according to the light of truth and reason, in just subordination to the authority of the Word of God.

1. I proceed then, brethren, according to the course proposed, to show, that the pronouncing a positive *anathema*, or solemn curse, upon all heresies, is a part of the modern creed of the Church of Rome: and for this purpose, I shall quote the formulary universally acknowledged amongst all Roman Catholics, viz: the creed of Pope Pius IV., in the latter clause of which we read as follows: "I profess and undoubtedly receive all things delivered, defined, and declared, by the sacred Canons and General Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent; and I also condemn, reject, and *anathematize* all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever, condemned and anathematized by the Church." A little farther on, the creed declares this to be a part of that "true Catholic faith, *out of which none can be saved.*"

Here, then, we see that each individual member of the Church of Rome is bound to unite with the Councils, and es-

pecially the Council of Trent, in pronouncing this anathema, or solemn curse. And of so much importance is this principle held, that the famous Delahogue, in the treatise now used as the class-book in the Irish Roman Catholic college at Maynooth, includes it in his formal definition of the Church. "The Church of Christ," says he, "is a Church, teaching, judging, and *anathematizing*." "This supposes," continues the author, "that the subjects of the Church are bound to obey her voice, and that if they prove rebellious, she can cast them out of her bosom." . . . "Therefore it is necessary to acknowledge, that all those heretics which the Church casts out, no longer belong to her. And on this very account, *they can have no hope of salvation*." (Tract. de Ecc. p. 15.) "It is manifest," saith he elsewhere, "that *in this sentence of eternal death*, we must include not only those whom the Church has cast out, *but those also who have left her*." (Ib. p. 16.) Mark, brethren, I pray you, that the Church's anathema is here called, in a book of established modern authority, a "*sentence of eternal death*;" and with this we shall find the constant usage of the Church of Rome to be in full accordance.

Thus, for example, pope Gregory VII., who dealt very extensively in ecclesiastical censures, expresses himself. Speaking of a bishop whom he had anathematized, and warning the inferior clergy to have no communion with him, he saith, "we have excommunicated him, and have separated him from the body of holy Church. For which reason we order you, by our apostolical authority, to shake off his yoke from your necks, lest you should also be made *the servants of the devil, whose member he has now become*." (Greg. Epist. 18. Hard. Conc. Tom. 6. pars 1. p. 1361.)

Again: "Separate them," saith the same pope, (ib. 1275, E.) "from the body and communion of the Church, by our apostolical authority, as stricken by the *sword of anathema*."

Again, the same pope threatens the obnoxious Carthaginians in these words: "If you do not perform this precept, I will strike you justly *with the sword of anathema*, and send forth against you *the curse of St. Peter, and my own.*" (Ib. 1215. A.)

Again, speaking of the clergy of Ravenna, he saith: "We cut them off with the *sword of anathema*, and cast them, *as putrid members, out of the whole body of Christ*, which is the Catholic Church."

And again, speaking of another obnoxious person, pope Gregory saith, (ib. 1418. D.) "which, if he shall refuse, he will provoke against himself *the anger and fury of Almighty God, through our apostolic excommunication.*" Now, in these various passages, we have the authority of the pope himself, for the meaning of the sentence of *anathema*. For he considers it plainly to be cutting men altogether off, as mortified members, and as with a sword, from the body of Christ; the giving them over as members of Satan, and the bringing down upon them the wrath and fury of God. What more grievous curse could possibly be allotted to man than this?

I have been thus particular, brethren, to explain the meaning of the term, because modern Roman Catholics are in the habit of softening it down, so as to make it signify nothing more than the ordinary excommunication practised amongst other Churches. Whereas, in the Church of Rome, there is the lesser excommunication, and the greater excommunication, and the anathema is held to be the highest of all. Perhaps, however, the most satisfactory evidence of the character of this sentence will be found in the form of its administration, which is as follows, in the words of the Roman pontifical. (Philpot's Let. to Butler, Supplement, p. 558.) "By the judgment of God the Father Almighty, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and of St. Peter, prince of the apostles, and all the saints, and by

the power of binding and loosing in heaven and in earth, conferred by God upon us, we separate this man from the reception of the precious body and blood of the Lord, and from the society of all Christians, and exclude him from the thresholds of holy mother Church in heaven and in earth, and we decree him to be excommunicated and anathematized, and adjudge him to be damned with the devil and his angels and all reprobates, to eternal fire; until he recover from the snares of the devil, and return to amendment and repentance, and satisfy the Church which he has injured; delivering him to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that his spirit may be saved in the day of judgment."

The effect of this sentence is supposed to be, that Satan immediately takes possession of his prey; for the form appointed to restore him to the Church contains an exorcism for the purpose of expelling the evil spirit. Thus, after the party has professed his belief in the articles of the creed, kneeling on his knees, the pontiff, wearing his mitre, rises from his seat, and says over him, still kneeling, these words: "I exorcise thee, O unclean spirit, by God the Father Almighty, and by Jesus Christ his Son, and by the Holy Ghost, that thou depart from this servant of God, whom God and our Lord vouchsafes to rescue from thy errors and deceits, and to recall to the holy mother, the Catholic and apostolic Church." (Ib. 559.) The light, therefore, in which those are regarded, who are under the anathema of the Church of Rome, is that of persons cut off from the Church, condemned to final damnation, and possessed by Satan even in the present life, unless they seek, by penitence and submission, to be reconciled to her.

You would probably infer, brethren, that however vast and awful the power of pronouncing this sentence of anathema may be, it is at least one which the Church of Rome does not pretend to exercise upon any but those who belong to her own

communion. In this, nevertheless, I am sorry to say, you would be quite mistaken. The Church of Rome considers herself the rightful head and mistress of the whole world, and therefore all who refuse to adopt her faith, and to bow to her authority, are styled heretics, and have the accumulated horrors of all anathemas poured down upon them. In proof of this assertion, I quote the declaration of the Council of Trent, in her catechism drawn up for universal parochial instruction: "Heretics and schismatics," says this catechism, "belong to the Church, only as deserters belong to the army from which they have deserted. It is not, however, to be denied, that they are still *subject to the jurisdiction of the Church*, inasmuch as they are liable to have judgment past on their opinions, to be *visited with spiritual punishments, and denounced with anathema.*" (p. 94 of Am. edition of Cat. of Coun. of Trent.) And as a proof of the terrible abundance in which the Church of Rome dispenses her maledictions, the single Council of Trent passed no less than one hundred and twenty-six distinct anathemas, of which every Christian denomination amongst the reformers was designed to have a considerable number, and our own Church would come in for no small share. Perhaps a few of these anathemas may as well be translated for your information, from which you may readily infer the character of the rest.

"VII. SESS. CANON I. (p. 27.)

"If any one shall say, that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, or that they are more or less than seven, viz: baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony; or that any of these is not truly and properly a sacrament, let him be *anathema.*" Here, brethren, there are three assertions which we maintain, all visited with this tremendous sentence, a three-fold curse in one.

" XIII. SES. CAN. I.

Again: " If any one shall deny that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is truly, really, and substantially contained, together with his soul, and divinity, and consequently all of Christ, but shall say that they are in it only in sign, or in figure, or in efficacy, let him be *anathema*."

CANON II.

Again: " If any one shall say, that in the holy sacrament of the eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remains, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, the appearances of bread and wine alone remaining, which conversion truly the (Roman) Catholic Church most aptly calls transubstantiation, let him be *anathema*."

CANON III.

Again: " If any one shall deny, that in the venerable sacrament of the eucharist, the whole of Christ is contained under either kind, and in all the parts of either kind after the separation is made, let him be *anathema*."

CANON VI.

And again: " If any one shall say, that in the holy sacrament of the eucharist, Christ, the only Son of God, is not to be adored with divine worship, even externally, and that he is not to be venerated by a peculiar festive celebration, nor carried about in public procession, according to the laudable and universal rite of the Church; or that he is not to be publicly held forth to the people to be worshipped, and that his adorers are idolators, let him be *anathema*."

Now in these four canons, there are contained nine distinct propositions, of which our Church holds eight, and the Lutheran Church holds the whole, each of which propositions is subjected to the awful sentence of the curse. And you will observe, brethren, that the anathema is not pronounced upon the *doctrine*, but upon the *persons who hold the doctrine*; so that in this small portion of the acts of this last council, you and I, with millions more of professed Christians, are under eleven distinct anathemas, three belonging to the canon first quoted, and eight belonging to the four others. There are, as I have said, one hundred and twenty-six of these anathemas, explicitly put forth by this council; and nearly all of them are like those which I have cited in this respect, that each anathema is declared at the end of several propositions, to every one of which it is grammatically applicable. So that it is probable, were we to count the separate propositions, we should find that not one hundred and twenty-six, but nearly three hundred of these solemn and awful curses have been fulminated by the Church of Rome against the rest of Christendom. Now, when you recollect the effects supposed to follow one single anathema, pronounced by one single bishop, and then remember that the concluding session of this famous council was attended by two hundred and sixty-five of the highest dignitaries of their Church, and that the whole was afterwards solemnly ratified and confirmed by the pope himself, you will have some faint idea of the horrible condition in which a sincere and intelligent Roman Catholic believes us all to be plunged, by our daring to worship God according to the pure light of his own Word, and the doctrines of the primitive fathers. And you will thus be prepared, brethren, to understand the next step in our melancholy history, namely, how naturally the *sword of anathema* stands connected with the *sword of persecution*.*

* For authorities against the temporal sword, see Picart, Tom. 2, Mémoires Historiques concernant l'Inquisition, p. 4, &c.

I shall not occupy your time by noticing the advances made towards the principle of religious persecution, prior to the 13th century, but shall come at once to the doctrine laid down by the great council of Lateran, A. D. 1215, under pope Innocent III., which fixes the principle upon the Church of Rome in the most direct and unquestionable terms, inasmuch as this was not only a general council, but the very largest that ever assembled together. The language of this decree on the subject of heretics will require some patience, brethren, for it is somewhat long; but if you desire a thorough understanding of the point before us, you will find it well worth attention; it is as follows: (Hard. Con. Tom. VII. p. 19, D.)

“We excommunicate and anathematize every heresy which lifts itself up against the holy, orthodox, and Catholic faith, condemning all heretics by whatever name they are known.”

“And those whom we have condemned are left to the secular princes and their officers, to be punished by the penalty due; the clergy being first degraded from their orders, in such wise that the property of those who are thus condemned shall be confiscated, if they be laymen, but if they are of the clergy, their property shall be applied to those Churches from which they have received their stipends.”

“And whoever shall be found under suspicion only, if they cannot prove their innocence by a satisfactory purgation according to the quality of the person and the character of the suspicion, they shall be struck with the sword of anathema, and shall be avoided by all, until they make due satisfaction; and if they remain thus excommunicated for one year, then they shall be condemned as heretics.”

“And the secular powers shall be admonished and exhorted, and if necessary, *they shall be compelled by ecclesiastical censure*, whatever offices they fill, if they desire to be themselves respected and held faithful, *publicly to take an oath* for the defence of the faith, that they will, *bona fide*, endeavour to

exterminate from the lands subject to their jurisdiction, according to their power, *all heretics denounced by the Church*; and let every one, without exception, entering upon any office, whether spiritual or temporal, be held to confirm this regulation by oath.”

“But if the temporal lord, being required and admonished by the Church, shall neglect to purge his territory from this heretical uncleanness, he shall be bound with the chain of excommunication by the metropolitan and the other provincial bishops. And if he does not render satisfaction within a year, let it be reported to the sovereign pontiff, in order that he may declare his subjects absolved from their allegiance to him, and may expose his territory to be occupied by Catholics, who, after the heretics are driven out, may possess it without contradiction, and preserve it in the purity of the faith. The rights of the sovereign lord, however, shall not be prejudiced herein, provided he puts no obstacle nor any impediment in the way. And the same law shall be kept in the case of those who have no chief lords above them.”

“Those Catholics, who, under the character of crusaders, have taken up arms to exterminate heretics, shall enjoy the same indulgence, and the same sacred privileges as those who have gone to the succour of the holy land.”

“And we further decree, that the believers, the receivers, the defenders and the favourers of heretics, be subjected to excommunication; and that after any such shall be notified of his excommunication, if he fail to render satisfaction within one year, he shall forthwith be declared *infamous, incapable of holding any public office*, as well as of electing others thereto, and also *incapable of giving testimony*. And he shall further be declared *incapable of making his will*, and shall neither be allowed to give away his property by will, nor to *receive* any property by inheritance from *others*.”

——“Moreover, if such person be a judge, *his sentence*

shall have no force, nor shall causes be any longer tried before him. If he be an advocate, his exercise of office shall not be admitted. If he be a notary, the instruments drawn up by him shall be of no weight, but shall be condemned with their condemned author. And in all other like cases, we command that the like rule be observed. But if he be of the clergy, let him be deposed from all benefit and exercise of his office, in order that where the guilt is the greater, the penalty may be the more severe."

—“And to these pestilent heretics, the clergy may not administer any of the sacraments, neither may they presume to give them Christian burial, neither may they receive of them any offerings or alms; otherwise such clergy offending herein shall be deprived of their office, to which they shall never be restored but by the special grace of the apostolic see.”

* * * * *

“And inasmuch as some of these heretics, under the mask of piety, but, as saith the apostle, denying the power thereof, pretend that they have authority to preach; notwithstanding the apostle saith: How shall they preach unless they be sent; therefore all who presume to usurp the office of preacher, either publicly or privately, being either prohibited, or not sent by the authority of the pope or of the Catholic bishop of the place, shall be bound by the chain of excommunication; and unless they speedily repent, shall be visited by the other pains and penalties.”

“And we add further, that every archbishop or bishop, by himself or by his archdeacon, or other fit and honest persons, *shall go round his own diocese, wherever it is reported that there are any heretics*, twice or at least once in every year, and shall *compel three or more men of good standing*, or if he think it expedient, *even the whole neighbourhood*, to make oath, that if any of them shall know of heretics in that place,

or others holding secret conventicles, or dissenting in faith or morals from the common conversation of the faithful, he will take care to inform the bishop concerning them. And the bishop himself shall call the accused before him, and if they shall fail to purge themselves from the crime, or after their purgation shall relapse into their old perfidy, let them be punished according to the canon. And if any, through their culpable obstinacy, reject the obligation of such an oath, and refuse to take it upon them, let them, on this very ground, be taken for heretics.”

“Therefore we decree and order, and in virtue of obedience strictly command, that the bishops diligently look to these regulations being strictly observed throughout their dioceses, *if they would themselves avoid the vengeance of the canon*. For if any bishop shall prove negligent or remiss in the duty of purging his diocese from the leaven of heretical pravity, and this can be proved by sufficient testimony, let him be deposed from the episcopal office, and a fit man be put in his place, who both can and will confound all heretical wickedness.”

I am afraid, brethren, that you have found this extract tedious, but I knew not how to abbreviate or omit any part of it, in justice to the subject; since it is the great document of the Roman Catholic Church, upon the point of persecution. And you perceive, that by the highest authority of their system, that of a General Council, consisting of twelve hundred prelates under the immediate presidency of the pope himself, all heretics are not only denounced with the tremendous sentence of anathema, but are further made liable to be stripped of their property, driven from their homes by violence, pronounced infamous, made incapable of giving testimony, and of either bequeathing property to others, or receiving any inheritance themselves. The heretical judge shall no longer hear causes, the heretical lawyer shall no longer be allowed to plead. The heretical notary even destroys the force of the instruments

which concern the rights of others. Volunteers are encouraged to take up the sword against them by the promise of peculiar privileges; princes and rulers are compelled to swear that they will exterminate them; and bishops and archbishops are obliged to perambulate their dioceses every year for the purpose of inquiring after them, under the penalty of losing their own offices, if they presume to show the smallest indulgence, or even remissness, in the work of persecution.

The zeal of this famous Council, and the vigorous efforts of the pope, however ill directed, were not, it must be granted, without cause; for it appears that there were immense numbers and many denominations of what they called heretics, at the time. Of their tenets, indeed, it is difficult, if not impossible, to speak precisely; because the writers on their side have not come down to us; and those on the side of the Church of Rome are not in the position of disinterested witnesses. The Albigenses, the Waldenses, and the poor men of Lyons, occupy the most prominent place in the chronicles of that age. And if the account which the modern Waldenses give of the matter be worthy of credit, we should all agree, that what the Council of Lateran stigmatized as heresy, was a far purer faith than their own.

But be this as it may, vast efforts were thought necessary for their suppression. Armies were raised against them at the earnest exhortations of the pope, the soldiers of which wore the sign of the cross. The holy crusade of the Church against the heretics, was preached from the pulpits with the utmost vehemence and ardour; and as an incentive to the courage of the recruits, the Roman Catholic historian, Baronius, relates, that the pope gave them "a full remission of all their sins." (Baron. 13, 121.)

The same author details many facts as to the mode of conducting this war against the heretics; which would shock our modern notions of humanity. In one instance, for example, he

mentions the case of 180 men, who, he says, "preferred being burned alive, rather than think rightly." (Ib. 156.) So large was the scale on which this work of heretical extermination was conducted, that the army of the crusaders under Simon de Montfort, amounted at one time to 300,000 men; and there is not a page in the history of the world more deeply stained with cruelty, barbarity, and foul excess, than that which has commemorated these wars miscalled holy; when fanaticism and superstition, beneath the banner of papal supremacy, revelled in pillage and in blood, under the outraged name of the Prince of peace.

Besides these crusades against the heretics, however, the pope found that some other plan must be devised in order to carry out the resolutions of the Council of Lateran. For the latter part of the canon which I have cited, in which the bishops and archbishops were commanded to become inquisitors of heresy, and to perambulate their dioceses every year for the purpose of discovering all that were suspected to hold heretical sentiments, was not obeyed with any thing like the vigour which the case required. In order to remedy this defect, the pope undertook to appoint inquisitors of his own, and to send them into the suspected districts, to hunt the heretics out of their concealments, and subject them to those punishments which had already been established, through the influence of the Church of Rome, in every part of Europe. And this was the next step towards the establishment of the Inquisition.

To show how this part of the work was carried on, we find Baronius stating, in one place, that there were various heretics of both sexes in Germany, France, and Italy, who were apprehended and burned alive. In the city of Argentine, more than eighty were arrested in A. D. 1215, of whom very few were found innocent. "And these," saith the historian, with admirable simplicity, "brother Conrad of Marpurg, who was the

apostolic inquisitor, was accustomed to prove, by obliging them to take hold of red hot iron, if they denied their heresy. And as many of them as were burned by the iron, he condemned as heretics, and delivered them to the secular judgment to be burned to death. Hence, with few exceptions," continues Baronius, "*all who were once accused, and were led to his tribunal for examination, were condemned to the flames.*" (Ib. p. 230.)

Nay, so extreme was the indignation of these inquisitors against heretics, that their very bones were not suffered to rest quietly in their graves. Thus, the historian relates, that one Almaric, a learned Parisian doctor, who had many followers, died of grief, because the bishops condemned his doctrines. His disciples were burned alive, and their ashes were scattered on the dunghill. But this did not suffice; for the body of Almaric was taken out of the grave, and burned also. (Ib. 225.) This became afterwards a very general custom with the Inquisition.

The complete establishment of this tremendous tribunal, however, was reserved for pope Gregory IX. who, A. D. 1233, perfected the work which his predecessors had successfully begun, by setting up regular permanent inquisitors in France, Spain, and Italy. A specimen of the course taken by the inquisitors of Thoulouse, as given by Baronius, may be not uninteresting.

"Just after the celebration of mass, by Raymond the bishop of Thoulouse, as he was sitting down to table in the refectory," says the historian, "it was told him that a certain matron of the city, surrounded by her sons, brethren and friends, was dying in the hands of heretics, being one of them herself, near the house of the inquisitors. He ran to the house immediately, and found the fact to be as it was reported, by the confession of the dying woman herself, who chose to die and be saved in her heresy. Accordingly, he condemned her forthwith, and

delivered her to the secular court, the officers of which *took her in the bed as she lay, carried her to the fire, and burned her joyfully.*" These, brethren, are the very words of the historian, without a single remark of disapprobation or surprise. Alas! who can wonder enough at the spectacle of Christian priests, condemning a woman for heresy on her very death-bed, and joyfully anticipating the stroke of nature, by committing her, in this condition, to the flames!

But I may not dwell any longer on these historical notices. Rather let me hasten to the last and worst form of this inquisitorial power, established in Spain under Ferdinand and Isabella, a few years before the time when Columbus discovered our new world. There was a good deal of objection made by the pope to this institution, at first; not, I am sorry to say, because of its cruelty, or its unchristian character, but because too much power was thrown by its constitution into the hands of the Spanish sovereigns, and too little into those of the pope. These objections, however, were overcome; and in A. D. 1483, pope Sixtus IV. formally acknowledged the celebrated Dominican, Torquemada, as Inquisitor General of Spain, and empowered him, by a bull, to establish inferior courts. In a few years, this tremendous tribunal prospered to such an extent, that it numbered twenty thousand spies and informers, and held the most uncontrolled and absolute empire over the whole nation. Any person accused of heresy was liable to be seized without the possibility of redress, and without knowing what was his crime, or who was his accuser. He was hurried away from home and kindred, and consigned to a cell in which was scarcely admitted a ray of light. He was not allowed books, conversation, or any visits from his nearest relations or friends, but was compelled to sit motionless and silent, and was sometimes detained in this deplorable condition for years, without being allowed any trial. When brought, at last, before the tribunal, he was not suffered to know who

accused him, or of what he was accused; but was obliged to answer, on oath, whatever questions the inquisitor should put to him, and was usually compelled, in this way, to go over the history of his whole life; the great point aimed at in the examination, being to make him accuse himself. If nothing heretical could be discovered by this process, he was next taken to a room fitted up for the purpose of torture. And three kinds of torment were there employed to force a confession. The place in which it was administered, was a deep subterranean grotto, so deep that the horrible cries of the unhappy wretch could not be heard. It was illuminated only by two torches which cast a feeble light, just sufficient to enable the culprit to discern the instruments of torture, with as many executioners as they needed to apply them. The executioners themselves were clothed in black, the head and the face being quite covered with a hood, which had holes in it for the eyes, the nose, and the mouth; so that a shapeless figure of black was all that could be seen. The inquisitors were always present, exhorting the poor wretch to confess, and if he still denied his *heresy*, the work of cruelty began.

The first kind of torment was called the torture of the cord. The accused person had his arms tied behind him, and was raised by a pulley to the ceiling, kept suspended there for some time, and then suddenly let down half way to the floor, with a shock which dislocated the joints, and forced him to shriek aloud with agony. This torture was endured for an hour or more, according to the judgment of the inquisitors, if the strength of the sufferer was able to bear it.

If no sufficient confession was produced by this, the torture of water was employed. The mode of administration was to pour water through a funnel into his throat, and then lay him on a hollow bench, constructed so as to close and press the body as much as they thought proper. Across this bench was a small piece of timber, laid so as to suspend him by the

spine of the back, which dislocated it with the most incredible torment.

The third kind of torture was called the torture by fire, and was the most dreadful of all. They kindled a large fire, they next rubbed the soles of the culprit's feet with lard, or other similar substances. They then laid him on the pavement with his feet towards the fire, and burned him in this manner, until he confessed all that they desired to know. These two kinds of torture lasted also an hour, and sometimes longer; and after it was over, the poor wretch was taken back to his cell, to suffer the excruciating consequences, until his firmness and constancy were quite destroyed.

When at last the tribunal had decided upon the guilt or innocence of their prisoners, the sentence was pronounced. Those who were discharged as innocent, were usually disfigured or crippled for life; and their property was dissipated, as well by the fact that the inquisitors seized upon it to support the expenses of the owner while in prison, as by the waste and rapacity of others, when the care of the lawful possessor was withdrawn. Some were admitted to confession and repentance, and thus escaped death; but were not only condemned to walk in the public procession on the great day of execution, but to submit to scourging, fines, imprisonment, or to wear a peculiar garment called the *san benito*. Besides which, they were declared infamous, and their children and grand-children with them. Those who were condemned to death were delivered over to be first strangled, and afterwards burned, or otherwise to be given up to the secular judge, in order to be burned alive, according to the degrees of their heretical guilt and obstinacy. And wonderful to tell, after all this dreadful barbarity had been exercised upon them, the grand inquisitor, in handing them over to the secular judge, *recommended them to mercy in a set form*: thus rendering still more revolting, the awful system, which engrafted such

horrible and atrocious cruelty upon the compassionate religion of the Gospel. The day of execution itself was invested with all the solemn magnificence and terror, which the united powers of Church and State could confer. The sovereigns, the nobility, and the judges, attended in pomp. The grand inquisitor was seated on the highest throne, and surrounded by all the clergy and the officials of this vast institution. And the previous night having passed with psalmody and chanting, and masses being said at day-break, and all the bells of the cathedral being sounded, a grand procession was formed from the principal Church; and when the king and queen, and the ladies of the court, and all the other dignitaries, and the host of the priests, and the criminals with their attendant officers, were in their places, a sermon was delivered in praise of the inquisition, representing it as the great instrument to preserve the purity of the Church; after which, the sentences were read, the punishments inflicted, the fires were lighted, and the miserable victims perished in the flames. Thus was the whole atrocious exhibition covered with the mantle of religion, and even its public and established title was the *auto da fè*, that is, **THE ACT OF FAITH!**

Brethren! although these statements are made from the most unquestionable authorities, and are as certain as any facts recounted in history, yet our minds experience some difficulty in believing that such enormities could ever have been perpetrated under the sanction and by the instrumentality of the ministers of the Gospel, yea, under the express government and through the zealous labours of those very popes, who called themselves the vicars of Christ Jesus. But such was the aspect of religious persecution for ages. And although the Reformation struck it with a powerful blow, although the indignation of Roman Catholics themselves was roused to resistance, so that the cruel system, notwithstanding the efforts of the popes, could never take root effectively, ex-

cept in Spain and Portugal, yet it remained in existence until the year 1808; and then it was destroyed, *not by the pope, nor by the Church of Rome, BUT BY NAPOLEON BONA-PARTE*, against whom the pope fulminated a bull of excommunication the year after, for daring to invade St. Peter's patrimony.

The estimate of Llorente, who had been himself connected with this horrible institution, gives us the most authentic account of the number of sufferers in the Inquisition of Spain alone, from the time of its establishment in A. D. 1481, to its abolition in A. D. 1808. The whole amounted to 341,021. Of these, 31,912 were burned; 17,659 who had either escaped, or died under imprisonment, were burned in effigy; and 291,456 were subjected to severe penance. We see, therefore, that the reign of the Inquisition, in its last and most formal shape, continued for 325 years. And as the whole number of its victims amounted to 341,000, we behold a frightful average of more than a thousand per annum, in the single nation of Spain, and for this single religious crime, called heresy; that is, the crime of believing that there was any error in the religion taught by the authority of the pope of Rome. Now you must add to this, a reasonable proportion for the Inquisitions of Portugal and of Goa; and then add the victims of the holy wars waged by the pope against the heretics from the early part of the 13th century; and then make a further allowance for the innumerable condemnations which must have taken place, under the horrible injunctions of the council of Lateran, by which something, more or less, must have been done, in every diocese and by every bishop, although not enough to satisfy the exterminating zeal of the sovereign pontiff; and then add to all this, the widows and the orphans, the infamy and the distress, which even extended, through two generations, to the children and grandchildren of the unhappy sufferers,—and the aggregate, brethren, will be

enough to make one stand aghast at such an enormous mass of complicated misery and torment,—all inflicted by the highest judgment of that Church which calls herself infallible, and all in the abused name of the Saviour of mankind.

But now arises the important question, what has all this cruelty to do with the real doctrine of the Church of Rome? Do not the Roman Catholics themselves regard it just as we do? Do they not strongly condemn the conduct of their popes, and distinctly declare, that all these horrible abuses grew out of the darkness and superstition of the middle ages, and formed no part of their Church's system? And why, therefore, should there be a recurrence to the past, for what is acknowledged upon all hands to have been an abomination, and which ought, if only for the sake of Christian charity, to be consigned to utter oblivion?

Such is the appeal, brethren, often heard in our liberal days, upon this serious subject. And to much of it, I gladly subscribe. I rejoice to do this justice to the Roman Catholics of France, Germany, Switzerland, Ireland, England, the Canadian provinces, and especially the United States, that I am fully persuaded of their accordance with ourselves in utter and absolute detestation of the principle of religious persecution, as manifested in the crusades against the heretics, and especially in the atrocious tribunal of the Inquisition. But this does not settle the question. I wish from my heart that it could. Unhappily, however, it will be seen, by a brief examination, that the *creed of their Church*, as they ALL acknowledge it, **MAKES THE POPE THE SUPREME JUDGE**, whether with or without a general council. And by that creed, either the determination of the point must be clearly against them, or the claims of their infallibility must be cast away forever. Let us, however, examine the question in both ways: first, as it would stand on the simple prerogative of the pope, and secondly, as it would stand on the doctrine of the councils.

With respect to the prerogatives of the pope, every Roman Catholic who understands his own system, acknowledges the sovereign pontiff to be the head of the Universal Church, the vicar of Christ, and the judge in the last resort of all ecclesiastical questions. Who then, shall pronounce him in error? Who, in the Church of Rome, shall undertake to correct the repeated decisions, public acts, and most zealous labours of the whole train of pontiffs, from the time of Gregory VII. in the beginning of the 11th, down to Pius VII. in the beginning of the 19th century, a period of full 700 years, in the whole of which the principle of religious persecution was avowed as a duty of conscience, a necessary act of Christian faith, and a prominent work of priests and princes throughout all Europe, by pope after pope, without one solitary exception? We say then, that granting the change of sentiment among Roman Catholics themselves, in all those countries which are under the influence of the Reformation; yet *their system does not allow the people, nor the body of the priesthood, to think for themselves, in this or any other point, where their Church is concerned.* The popes are the judges. The vicar of Christ, as they esteem him, is the centre of unity and the fountain of authority. And until the judgment of the pope can be shown to have changed with respect to the question, the system of their Church must be taken to be just what it was, notwithstanding the acknowledged improvement in the opinions and feelings of her people.

But in the second place, let us try the point upon the other ground, namely, on the authority of the councils. And here, I have quoted to you, brethren, at large, the conclusive evidence of the great council of Lateran, where not only is the hunting out of heretics commanded imperatively of every prince, and lord, and bishop, and archbishop, in order that they may be *exterminated*, but especially, where the crusaders, who have taken up arms against the heretics, are rewarded with

the remission of sins. Nothing can be more manifest than the perfect agreement in this matter, between the pope and this great council; and if we examine the acts of the general councils which came afterwards, it is impossible to discover the slightest intimation of any other principle.

Amongst these, however, the council of Florence stands distinguished; because the English and American Roman Catholics in our day, appeal to the decree of this council, as being the only true declaration of doctrine concerning the power of the pope. It is in the following words:

“ We also define, that the holy apostolic see, and the Roman pontiff, hold the primacy through the whole world, and that the Roman pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles, and the true vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians; and that to him in blessed Peter, *full power is given by our Lord Jesus Christ, to feed, to rule and to govern the whole Church, in like manner as the same is contained in the acts of general councils, and in the sacred canons.*” (Hard. Con. Tom. 9, p. 986.)

Now here, brethren, is the decree passed by this celebrated general council under pope Eugenius, in A. D. 1439, when two hundred and twenty-four years had elapsed after the great council of Lateran, during the whole of which period the holy wars and the pope's inquisitors had been carrying on the work of exterminating heretics in the face of all Europe, with universal consent and approbation. And what do this council enact upon the subject? Do they say one word to restrain the pope's prerogative? Do they insinuate that he had taken too much upon him? Do they question the correctness of his doctrine, or deny that the duty of exterminating heretics with fire and sword had been truly set forth as a part of the Christian faith? So far from it, that the pope is declared to have *full power*, not only to feed, but to rule and govern the whole

Church. He is said to be the vicar of Christ, and to be the father and teacher of all Christians. And therefore we have another general council, setting its seal, in large terms, to the widest extent of the papal supremacy, with the pope's theory and practice of religious persecution for more than two centuries standing before them. But truly it seems almost a mockery to refer us to this council, for an amelioration of the pope's authority in the point of persecution, when it was one of their acts to justify the emperor Sigismund in violating his own safe conduct, for the purpose of delivering John Huss, the Bohemian reformer, to the flames.

Lastly, let us ask the council of Trent, whether they undertook to lay down a different doctrine; and we shall receive for answer, that although they knew the indignant censures of the reformers on this point perfectly well, and also knew the strong disapprobation which many of their own Church, especially in France, had manifested towards the Inquisition, yet they passed the whole subject by, notwithstanding the very object of their assembling was avowed to be *a general reformation of the Church, both in the head and the members*. But although they avoided saying any thing on the direct point of persecution, they recorded a longer list of anathemas or solemn curses against the heretics, than had ever been exhibited before; and in their Catechism they took care to have it universally proclaimed, that *heretics are under the jurisdiction of the Church of Rome*, in the same manner as *deserters* are considered to belong *to the army from which they have deserted*. Add to all this the fact already mentioned, that the Inquisition was not suppressed until 1808, and then not by the Church of Rome, but by Napoleon Bonaparte, and the evidence seems to my mind, conclusive; although the reign of the English queen Mary, and the revocation of the edict of Nantes, and the awful tragedy of St. Bartholomew's day, would of themselves furnish proof more than enough to fill a volume.

But passing by these events, which our limits will not allow me to detail, and resting merely on the very imperfect sketch I have exhibited, no honest Roman Catholic can say that his Church has abandoned the principles of the Council of Lateran, or that her rulers have changed one article of that cruel and sanguinary system which, for the last seven centuries, has endeavoured to protect her creed, by the terrors of the rack and the prison, the sword and the flames.

But, blessed be God! a mighty change has indeed been wrought by the glorious Reformation, although popes and councils, the creed and the rulers of the Church of Rome, are still what they were in the dark ages. Her people, far and wide, have begun to think and to feel rightly upon this subject; her champions themselves struggle hard to cast off the very imputation of her persecuting principles; they strive to bury in utter oblivion the records of the past, and when they are obliged to recall them, they exert their utmost skill to make their greatest severities look like a benevolent anxiety for the salvation of mankind. The truth appears to be, that the Church of Rome is in a transition state, to do justice to which requires careful discrimination. We should gladly distinguish between the system of Rome, and the people who so often profess it, without being fully aware of its obnoxious principles. We doubt not that there are multitudes, even among her priests, who are strangers to many important portions of their own history; and who, in simplicity and sincerity, believe and teach doctrines, which, if they had lived in Italy, or Spain, only one hundred years ago, would probably have brought them to the tortures of the Inquisition. Widely different from the condition of these, however, is that of the better informed, who know the truth, but have too little moral courage to confess it; who employ their talents in an ingenious attempt to mystify the facts, by distorting the testimony of history; and who thus hope to move along in harmony with the liberal

maxims of the age, without giving up their professed confidence in their Church's infallibility. May the Spirit of Christ give them boldness to follow out their convictions, honestly to oppose what they know to be erroneous, and thus bring their Church home to her first love, according to the pure doctrines of the written Word, and the mild and gentle temper of the Gospel.

Meanwhile, my brethren, it is vain to hope that the complete regeneration of the Church of Rome can ever be brought about by any other ordinary means, than the increased spirit of inquiry amongst the honest-hearted of her priests, and the intelligent portion of her laity. It is in originating and fomenting this spirit of inquiry, that the Reformation has already done them so great a service; and we humbly trust that the progress of light and knowledge will advance amongst them with accelerated speed, until the time shall come for another council, far more general than that of Trent, whose decrees shall openly rebuke the cruel despotism of the dark ages, and re-establish the mild government of the primitive Church once more:— a council which should take the precept of St. Paul for their motto: *Bless and curse not*; which should grant to others the toleration which they claim for themselves, and leave to HIM who is the only UNERRING JUDGE, the awful work of condemnation.

Having now finished the first part of our series, embracing the preliminary subjects of the rule of faith, the papal supremacy, and the intolerance, anathemas, and cruel persecution connected therewith, I design, by the favour of Providence, to commence the next series with the topic of celibacy, which, in her priesthood, and her hosts of monks and nuns, forms so important a peculiarity of the Church of Rome. And in conclusion, my beloved brethren, let me beseech you to unite with me in practising that precept of our divine Master, which saith, “ Bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despite-

fully use you and persecute you." If the Church of Rome, in her Council of Trent, and her creed of pope Pius IV., pours her anathemas upon us, let us pray for a blessing upon her in return. If her rulers had the power, we have every reason to believe that they would indeed despitely use us and persecute us, and think, as their predecessors did in the destruction of our forefathers, that they were doing God service. But be it our place to pray the Father of mercies to heal their blindness, to reform their errors, and to turn their hearts. And while we praise him with adoring gratitude for the precious jewel of our own Christian liberty, let us do our utmost to extend the privilege to every other portion of the Universal Church, earnestly beseeching the omnipotent Redeemer to hasten the time, when all shall worship the only true God in the unity of the Spirit, and every man shall sit under his own vine and his own fig-tree, with none to make him afraid.

LECTURE X.

1 TIM. iii. 4, 5, 6, together with 12th verse.—“ It behoveth, therefore, a bishop to be blameless, the husband of one wife, sober, prudent, of good behaviour, chaste, given to hospitality, a teacher, not given to wine, no striker, but modest, not litigious, not covetous, but one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all chastity. But if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God. Let deacons be the husbands of one wife, who rule well their children, and their own houses.” (Doway Version.)

THESE words, brethren, which I have set down precisely as they stand in the Roman Catholic version of the Scriptures, commonly called the Doway Bible, are invested with peculiar interest, on account of the extraordinary fact, that the Church of Rome has set up a doctrine directly contrary. For, as you must be aware, she does not suffer her bishops, priests, and deacons, to have wives or children at all; so that on this point, the Word of God and the word of that Church stand in the most manifest opposition. “ Let the bishop be the husband of one wife,” saith the Scripture. *Nay*, saith the Church of Rome, *the bishop shall not marry*. “ Let the bishop rule his own house well,” saith the Scripture, “ having his children in subjection.” *Nay*, saith the Church of Rome, *he shall have no children*. “ If a man know not how to rule his own house,” saith the Scripture, “ how shall he take care of the Church of God?” *An idle argument*, saith the Church of Rome, *for the*

government of a man's own house and the care of the Church of God, should not be united in the same hands. "Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife," continues the Word of God, "who rule well their children and their own houses." *By no means*, replies the Church of Rome, *the deacons must be like the bishops, having no wives, no children, no houses to rule.* You perceive, therefore, brethren, that the denial of the rule of Scripture could not be more positive—the contradiction to it could not be more glaring: so that the mind, accustomed to the simple authority of the Bible, is amazed at the boldness of this flagrant opposition, and wonders how it can admit of palliation or excuse.

Let us, then, examine the argument by which this strange and most unscriptural regulation is maintained, and connect with it the kindred topics of monastic life and sanctity, as professed in the Church of Rome. The principle of voluntary mortification is the common basis of this part of their system, and it assumes the utmost importance when it is considered as resulting in the worship of the saints, and the doctrine of works of supererogation.

The argument in favour of celibacy has been set forth by St. Jerome with more zeal than any other of the ancient fathers, and nothing has been added since his day to the logic of the matter, although a great deal has been added to its vows and compulsory restrictions. I shall state his views, therefore, in order to yield to the other side all the weight which belongs to his distinguished name, and to the comparatively early period at which he flourished, viz: the latter part of the fourth, and the beginning of the fifth century.

His first argument is derived from St. Paul's epistle to the Corinthians, in which the apostle plainly gives the preference to celibacy over marriage; and in estimating its comparative excellence, Jerome considers marriage as silver, and celibacy as gold. (Jer. adv. Jovin. op. om. Tom. 2, p. 16, 17.)

2d. He next argues, that on the authority of the same apostle, matrimony prevents, by its unavoidable cares, the entire devotion of the soul to the service of God. (Ib. 21.)

3d. He adduces the examples of Elijah and Elisha, John the Baptist, John, the beloved disciple, and Christ himself, as being all in favour of a single life; and urges that this must needs be the superior state, because, in heaven, they neither marry nor are given in marriage.

4th. He insists on one passage in the epistle of St. Jude, and another in the Book of Revelations, strongly inferring the superiority of celibacy. (Ib. 34.)

5th. He derives an argument of expediency from the high respect in which celibacy was held by the heathen. (Ib. 35.)

6th. And lastly, he cites from Theophrastus, a long and amusing list of the risks, the disappointments, the troubles, and the inevitable trials of the marriage state.

In answer to all this it is sufficient for us to say, that the controversy is not about the comparative merits or privileges of the two states of life. Doubtless, each has its advantages. The question, however, turns upon the rule laid down for the ministry by the Word of God, and upon the right of the Church of Rome to destroy that rule, by confining the priesthood to those who abjure matrimony; thus opposing the authority of the Holy Spirit, and putting a yoke upon the clergy, which the almighty Lawgiver had decreed they should not bear.

We have already shown the total contrariety of this yoke, to the positive directions of St. Paul to Timothy. Those directions he gives, as the commandments of Christ himself; whereas, in the other passages, he expressly declares that he does not speak in his usual strain of authority, because he had received no commandment upon the subject of celibacy, and therefore that what he was about to say was only his own private judgment. Besides which, he evidently intends his ad-

vice, not so much for a *permanent*, as for a *temporary* purpose, because he recommends it as being "*good for the present distress*," that those who were unmarried should remain so. The meaning of this language is well understood on all sides, since it was a time of grievous persecution, when Christians did not know at what moment they might be called to abandon home, property, nay, life itself, in order that they should be faithful to the Gospel. And in addition to this, it should be considered conclusive, that when St. Paul recommends celibacy in preference to matrimony, *he is not referring to the clergy at all*, but speaks generally about what seemed to him *expedient*, at that time, *for all Christians*, without the slightest allusion to bishops, priests, or deacons. Whereas, when he writes by inspiration to Timothy upon the very subject of the ministry, he specifies bishops and deacons; and plainly lays down the general rule for them, that they should be the husbands of one wife, ruling their own children and households well. In the application of Jerome's argument, therefore, to the clergy, the Church of Rome has committed three fatal mistakes. First, they strain St. Paul's advice, intended for the time of persecution, into a standing law. Next, they apply to a particular order what the apostle meant for all. And lastly, they deprive that order of the very rule which the apostle laid down for them.

I shall now proceed to show, that in obedience to this apostolic authority, the primitive Church for many centuries left the ministry their Scriptural liberty in the matter; so that the restriction established subsequently by the influence of Rome, was an innovation, not only upon the Word of God, but also upon the practice of Christian antiquity. And this we shall demonstrate by the acts of Councils, and the testimony of the fathers, including Jerome himself. Of course, brethren, you understand, that we do not refer to the evidence of the primitive Church, either for the purpose of weakening or super-

seding, in any respect, the supreme and only infallible law of Scripture; but we do it on the principle explained in a former lecture, that the sense of antiquity is the best rule in the construction of Scripture; and in all questions belonging to the Roman Catholic controversy, we do it with the greater care, for the sake of those whose errors we are discussing, because tradition is, in their judgment, equally binding with the written Word of God.

To begin, then, with Tertullian, whose testimony comes within one hundred years of the apostle John,—we find him expressly giving his interpretation of St. Paul's language in these words: "The apostle," saith he, "although he prefers the virtue of continence, yet permits marriage to be contracted and used; and argues in favour of retaining rather than of separating from a wife. And it is plain, that while Moses allows divorces, Christ forbids them." (Ter. adv. Mar. lib. v. p. 469.)

Again he saith: "It was lawful for the apostles to marry, and to lead their wives about with them. And it was lawful for them to live or be supported by the Gospel. But he who did not use this right, provokes us to imitate his example on the ground, that the license furnishes an opportunity to show the trial of our abstinence." (Ib. de Exhort. Cast. p. 522.)

Again, saith Tertullian, "Christ fully and precisely declares that those who enter into the episcopal office should be the husbands of one wife.—And we shall err greatly if we think that what is not lawful for the priests, is lawful for the people." (Ib. 522, A.)

And again: "We never read of marriage being forbidden," saith he, "for it is good. But we learn from the apostle what is better than good, *permitting* to marry, but *preferring* to abstain; the first on account of temptation, the second on account of the *affliction of the times*."

Let us next listen to Clement of Alexandria, on the subject

of celibacy. "The apostle saith, it is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine, if any one eateth with offence. And again, it is good to remain unmarried, even as I. But nevertheless," continues Clement, "he who uses these things, giving God thanks, and he who uses them not, giving God thanks, do both live rightly, if governed by moderation and temperance." (Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. iii. p. 462.)

Again, saith this eminent father, "The apostle plainly allows every one to be the husband of one wife, whether he be a priest, or a deacon, or a layman, so that he use marriage without reprehension." (Ib. 464.)

Again, opposing the error of the Gnostic heretics, Clement saith, "Do these men not hesitate to reprove even the apostles? For Peter and Philip had sons, and Philip (the deacon) gave his daughter in marriage. And Paul certainly does not blush to call her his wife in a certain epistle, whom, nevertheless, he did not lead about, because she could not aid him in the work of his ministry. Therefore, he saith in this epistle, Have not we power to lead about a wife who is a sister, like the rest of the apostles? But these, indeed, as was suitable to their ministry, did not lead about their partners so much in the capacity of wives, as sisters; for their wives exercised a useful ministry themselves among the women that remained at home, so that in the most private apartments of the females, the doctrine of the Lord was brought without censure or suspicion." (Ib. 448.)

Again: "There are certain persons," saith Clement, (ib. 446) "who openly say, that matrimony is sinful;" (fornication) "and glorify themselves by pretending that they imitate our Lord, who neither was married, nor possessed any earthly goods, boasting that they understand the Gospel better than others. But they are ignorant of the reason why the Lord did not marry. First, then, let them remember, that he has his own spouse, which is the Church. Next, that he was not a

common man, who needed a helpmate according to the flesh. Neither was it necessary for HIM to marry, who can create, and who is eternal, being born the only Son of God."

And once more: Clement tells an interesting anecdote of St. Peter, which is worthy of commemoration. "They relate," saith he, "that the blessed Peter, when he saw his wife led to death, rejoiced that she was called, and was about to return to her home; and when he had exhorted and comforted her, he finally addressed her by name, and said, O thou! remember the Lord. Such," observes Clement, "was the marriage of these saints, and their perfect affection." (Ib. 756.)

Now, in these extracts, brethren, you plainly perceive, that the disposition to depreciate marriage, and to make celibacy the law of the *clergy* at least, began, like every other corruption of primitive Christianity, to show itself very early; and at length it gained the victory, and maintains it in the Church of Rome to this day. But I shall next show you, from the works of Jerome himself, that it had not in his time become the established law, even in Rome: and you will remember, that he died, A. D. 422, so that he belongs to the latter part of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century.

Thus, for example, in his epistle to Nepotian on the life of the clergy, he tells him, "that the preacher of continence ought not to seek marriage. For since it is he," saith Jerome, "who reads the apostle, saying: 'It remains that those that have wives should be as those that have none,' why should he prevail upon a maiden to marry him?" This language, brethren, is only consistent with the fact, that a clergyman in Jerome's days might enter into matrimony if he pleased; for no such exhortation would be needed after a positive law of the Church had taken the liberty away.

In his first book against Jovinian, however, he speaks still more plainly. "If Samuel, nourished in the tabernacle, took a wife," saith Jerome, "what does that prove against celibacy?"

As if there were not, *in our own day also, many priests who are in the married state*, and the apostle himself describes a bishop as the husband of one wife, having his children in subjection with all gravity." (Tom. II. Op. om. Hieron. p. 25, D.)

Again, Jerome expressly saith, "I do not deny that married men are chosen for bishops, because there are not as many single as are necessary for the priesthood." "But how happens it, you will say, that frequently in the sacerdotal order, the single man is passed by, and the married man is elected? Because he may be wanting in the other qualities which the sacred office requires." (Ib. p. 30, E.)

Nothing can be plainer, brethren, than these passages, to prove that Jerome, with all his zeal for celibacy and antipathy to marriage, was still surrounded by married clergy; and that as yet the Word of God had not been overborne, in this respect, by the wisdom of men.

To show still more clearly, however, how far Jerome's doctrine was, from being the established opinion of his day, I shall quote a passage from his epistle to Pammachius, where he thanks his friend for having bought up the books which he wrote in depreciation of matrimony, and regrets that it was too late. "I am well aware," saith he, "of what you have prudently and affectionately done, in withdrawing from circulation the copies of my little work against Jovinian. But your diligence has profited me nothing, for I am informed that the book has been in circulation at Rome, and as you have yourself read: 'the word once uttered, cannot return.'" (Ib. p. 81, D.)

Our next evidence upon the subject is extracted from Gelazius of Cyzicen's history of the great council of Nice, which met in A. D. 325, upon the subject of the Arian heresy, at the summons of Constantine, the Roman emperor, a few years before Jerome was born, and consisted of three hundred and eighteen bishops.

“It was proposed,” says the historian, “in this council, to declare, that it was not fit for ecclesiastical persons, whether bishops, or presbyters, or deacons, or sub-deacons, or any others of the sacred order, to live with the wives whom they had married when they were laymen. And, as they were about to pass this rule accordingly, the holy Paphnutius, rising in the full council of the bishops, said with a loud voice: ‘Forbear, brethren, to lay this heavy yoke upon ecclesiastics. For marriage is honourable among all, (saith the apostle,) and the bed undefiled. Do not, therefore, injure the Church, by the unreasonable excess of so severe a law, for all cannot bear that mode of life which allows nothing to the human affections. In my judgment, none (of us) will be saved in love, if (we decree) that husbands shall separate themselves from their wives. I hold that marriage deserves to be esteemed the best continence, nor can we separate the woman whom God has joined to her husband, when he was a reader, or a singer, or a layman.’ Thus,” continues the historian, “did the great Paphnutius argue, although he was himself an unmarried man, and had been educated in a monastery from his childhood. And accordingly, being persuaded by his counsel, the whole assembly of the bishops held their peace, and left it to the free will of the married clergy to act as they thought proper.” (Mansi Concil. Tom. ii. p. 759.)

Another very direct and strong proof of the state of the matter in the early part of the fourth century, is furnished by the Council of Gangris, which was, indeed, a provincial council, but approved by pope Leo IV. The following canons will show this distinctly.

“CANON IV.

“If any one shall contend that a priest, who has married a wife, is therefore not fit to celebrate the sacred rites, and offer the holy eucharist, *let him be anathema.*”

"CANON X.

"If any one of those who have professed celibacy for the Lord's sake, shall insult over those who have taken wives, *let him be anathema.*"

Here we see, at once, both the boastful pride of the advocates for clerical celibacy, and the vigorous determination of the council to protect the rights of the married clergy; plainly showing that two parties were already formed in the Church, of whom the innovators grew stronger, until they gained their point. But not without many struggles and much opposition was this done, even in the Church of Rome, while the great Council of Trullo, so late as A. D. 706, recorded this solemn condemnation of the new doctrine, in their thirteenth canon; the language of which is as follows:

"Forasmuch as we are informed, that the Roman Church has put forth a canon, ordering that all those who are to be promoted to the office of deacon or priest, shall profess that they will no longer live together with their wives: we, on the contrary, keeping the rule of apostolic perfection and order, decree, that the legitimate marriages of all persons in holy orders shall be held firm and established, by no means dissolving their union with their wives, nor depriving them of any matrimonial privilege. Wherefore, if any one be found worthy to be ordained a subdeacon, or a deacon, or a presbyter, let him by no means be prohibited from that sacred order because he cohabits with his lawful wife. Nor shall he be asked at the time of his ordination, whether he intends to separate from his wife. For otherwise we should do injury to that marriage, which God has constituted, and blessed by his presence. The voice of the gospel exclaims, Those whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder. The apostle teaches, that marriage is honourable and the bed undefiled: and again he saith, 'Art thou tied to a wife? Seek not to be loosed.' — If any one, therefore, shall dare, against the apostolic canons, to

incite those who are in holy orders, whether subdeacons, deacons, or priests, to separate from their wives and deprive them of their society, *let him be deposed.*" (Hard. Con. Tom. III. p. 1666.)

This testimony, brethren, is sufficiently distinct, so far as the matrimonial rights of the presbyters and inferior clergy are concerned; but the influence of the new doctrine was so powerful at this time, that the previous canon of the same council requires the *bishops* to separate from their wives, expressly declaring, however, that this was not on the ground of any principle of divine truth, or ecclesiastical authority, but *solely in regard to the opinions of the people.* And such is the rule of the Greek and Russian Churches to the present day, their bishops being single men, but all the rest of the clergy being free to marry. But you will naturally inquire, what could have induced the Church to bring in this doctrine of celibacy, so opposite to the whole strain of the Mosaic dispensation, and to the plain language of the New Testament. And this, brethren, we shall endeavour to explain, on the surest ground of historical fact, and ecclesiastical policy.

Long before the time of our blessed Saviour, there were, as you all know, a variety of heathen philosophers in the world, who were celebrated for their supposed superiority over the rest of mankind. Of these, all the most distinguished sects contributed, more or less, to the triumph of the gospel, inasmuch as many of their disciples became convinced of the truth of Christianity, and devoted to that divine truth, their learning and their zeal. But, as might be naturally expected, a large proportion of these converts were disposed to modify the religion which they embraced, by as much of their former philosophy as they could conveniently combine with it; and thus arose the enormous variety of heresies which distracted the primitive Church, and which might, for the most part, be traced to the prevailing influence of some philosophical sect or party.

Amongst these systems of ancient philosophy, however, none were more remarkable than that of the Gymnosophists, or Brachmans of India. Of their particular doctrines, indeed, we know much less than we do of the philosophy of Greece, but we know that they were distinguished by their constant warfare upon the appetites of the flesh, seeking by continual meditation, and the severest austerities, to overcome all sensuality, and thereby, as they conceived, unite themselves with the Deity. So far did they carry this notion, that they sometimes burned themselves alive, in order to be purified the sooner; of which two noted instances are mentioned, that of Calanus in the presence of Alexander the great, and the other of Xarimarus at Athens, before Augustus the Roman emperor. (Am. Ency. Art. Gymnosophists.)

You will at once be reminded, brethren, by this brief outline, of the superstitions of the Bramins, who form the priesthood of the Hindoos to this day, and who trace their descent from a very remote antiquity, being, in all probability, derived from the stock we have just described. The principle of religion with both seems to have been the same, namely, the effort to unite the soul to the Deity by the practice of the most rigorous abstinence, and painful austerities. Thus among the Bramins, flesh and eggs are forbidden food, and rules of purification, fasting, penances, and ablutions are strictly required, as preservatives from sin. There are four stages marked out for them, in the third of which they become *Vana Prasthas*, or inhabitants of the desert. They then retire to the forest, live on roots, green herbs, and water, and practice the most rigorous mortification. "Let the *Vana Prastha*," says Menou, in the Institute, "slide backwards and forwards on the ground, or stand the whole day on tiptoe, or continue rising and sitting down alternately; in the hot season let him sit exposed to five fires, in the rain let him stand uncovered, in the cold season let him wear wet garments; then having stored up his

holy fires in his mind, let him live without external fire, without a shelter, wholly silent, and feeding on roots and fruit. When he shall have thus become void of fear and sorrow, and shaken off his body, he rises to the divine essence." In the fourth state, they are called *Sannyasi*, and new and still more severe penances are performed; all for the same purpose of conquering the flesh, and becoming exalted to a participation of the divine nature. The honours formerly paid to these devotees were almost unbounded. Kings and people rendered them the highest reverence, and the severity of their self-torment was the unfailing measure of their influence and their fame.

The accounts we have of the modern Fakirs are sufficiently known, to furnish the details of this last stage of Hindoo superstition. They retire from the world and give themselves up to meditation, practising, meanwhile, the most cruel penances. Some roll themselves constantly in the dirt. Others hold one arm raised in a fixed position so long, that it becomes withered, and remains immovable for life. Others keep their hands clasped, until the nails grow into the flesh and come through on the other side. They make a vow of poverty, live at the expense of the community wherever they appear, and are venerated by the people with the deepest devotion.

The identity of the country, the name of Brachman, and the perfect similarity of the principle, warrant the belief, that the philosophy of the ancient Gymnosophists, otherwise called the oriental philosophy, and what we now call Hindooism, were substantially the same system. But however this may be, it seems sufficiently certain, that the earliest and most obstinate of the heresies which infested the primitive Church, under the name of Gnosticism, was the result of the endeavour to engross the oriental philosophy upon the pure doctrines of the Word of God; and that to this we may trace, not only the rule of clerical celibacy, but the rise of monks and nuns, together with the whole train of self-tormenting penances which

we shall have occasion to present to you, from the lives of the canonized saints in the Roman Calendar.

This heresy of the Gnostics was divided into several sects, of which the Valentinians and the Marcionites were the most numerous and influential. It was a common doctrine with them all, however, that *matter was eternal*, and was *essentially evil*; and that the soul could only become united to Christ by combating this evil during its abode in the body, and having as little to do with the indulgence of every appetite as possible. Hence they avoided flesh, wine, and marriage; gave themselves up to religious contemplation, and practised austerities on principle; looking down with the utmost contempt on the catholics or orthodox Christians, because they were what they called carnal and ignorant men, and valuing themselves as the only possessors of spiritual knowledge and illumination.

Against these, the early fathers were constantly engaged in controversy. Irenæus composed his whole work for the purpose of combating their errors, which were by no means confined to their austerities, but extended to the subversion of almost every other principle of Christianity. Tertullian wrote largely against them; so did Clement of Alexandria; and in a word, we meet with continual reference to them, in all the writers of the Church, until the fifth century; after which they disappeared, as a distinct sect, although they left impressions on the Christian system which perhaps may last until the end of the world.

There was yet another quarter, from which a strong influence in favour of clerical celibacy operated on the Church of Rome; and that was the institution of the *vestal virgins*, which were held, since the days of Numa Pompilius, in such high regard; and to which the heathen, in their disputations with Christians, were apt to refer, with especial pride and satisfaction. It was also one of the Roman laws, that the heathen

priests should only be allowed to marry once; a rule to which Tertullian, and after him Jerome, never failed to have recourse, when arguing against matrimony.

Here then, brethren, we may readily perceive the origin of the pernicious law which the Church of Rome adopted. Many of her priesthood having been themselves disciples of the eastern philosophy, all of them being often taunted and provoked to a kind of emulation by the superior austerities of the Gnostic heretics, and being abundantly convinced, through the blind admiration of the multitude, that a large increase of influence was likely to be gained in favour of the truth, by the adoption of every thing which savoured of self-denial, they would be induced, from motives of Christian zeal in the first place, and from an honest belief of its real advantages as they went on, that it was expedient to bind this yoke upon themselves; and once introduced,—the reverence of the people once manifested in favour of what they would call a higher character of devotedness,—it is evident that it would go on, hand in hand, with every other branch of superstition, until it reached an excess, which doubtless none of its first advocates could have anticipated.

But this brings us to the chief development of the principle in the monastic system, which we shall find establishing itself in the Church of Rome through the influence of the same Jerome, after it had been practised for a considerable period in Egypt and Syria. The idea of leaving the world for solitude, giving up the whole life to religious contemplation, and mortifying the flesh by all imaginable penances and self-denial, has been already stated as familiar to the Orientalists, long before the coming of our blessed Redeemer. The date of its formal introduction amongst Christians, however, is set down to the year 305, when Anthony, frequently styled the great, collected a number of hermits in the deserts of Upper Egypt, where they built their huts close together, and per-

formed their devotions in common. One of his disciples, named Pachomius, formed a still more compact society upon the island of Taberna, in the Nile, about the middle of the fourth century, where they were brought under the observance of a strict rule, and were governed by a prior. And so rapidly did this new institution increase, that at the death of Pachomius, his colony of monks amounted to 50,000 persons. Basil, the celebrated bishop of Cesarea, next distinguished himself by founding convents for females on a similar plan, to which he prescribed a stricter rule, which was extensively observed and highly revered. But the making a *public profession*, and taking *irrevocable vows for life*, was not established, until the time of St. Benedict, in the sixth century, at his monastery called *Monte Casino*, near Naples; from which period the character of the monastic institution was more powerfully marked than before. Its influence upon the Church in discipline, doctrine, and government, was indeed very perceptible so early as the fourth century; but it became almost absolute during the dark ages, and, notwithstanding the check given to it by the Reformation, is operating far and wide upon the world at this very hour.

A few extracts from Jerome, who was himself a monk, with the liberty, however, that characterized monachism in his day, may be acceptable, as showing the spirit and the rise of this remarkable institution.

“To me,” saith Jerome, “the city is a prison, and the desert is a paradise.” (Op. Om. Tom. I. p. 29.) Then, commending the monastery for its spiritual discipline, he says, “There you live under the government of one father, in the company of many; that of one you may learn humility, of another, patience. This brother will teach you silence, that brother will teach you meekness; you cannot do as you would, you eat what you are ordered, you wear what is given to you, you accomplish the allotted task of your labour, you

are subjected to what you like not, you come weary to your pallet, you sleep as if in haste, and before your sleep is finished, you are compelled to arise. You say the appointed psalm in your heart, in which not the sweetness of the voice but the affection of the mind is required; you serve your brethren, you wash the feet of the guests, you suffer reproofs in silence, you fear the president of the monastery as the Lord, you love him as a father. You believe whatever he orders will be useful to you, nor do you judge the opinion of your superiors, since it is your office to obey and perform whatever they order you. Occupied by all these, you will have no leisure for idle thoughts; and while you pass from this to that, labour follows labour, and you will only retain in your mind what you are obliged to do." (Ib. p. 30. F.) "Go therefore, and live in a monastery, that you may be worthy to be admitted among the clergy." (Ib. p. 31. B.)

In this description of the duties and character of a monk, there is no *vow* of perpetual celibacy, poverty, and obedience to the end of life, nor any obligation laid upon the individual to stay in the monastery longer than he was so disposed. These vows, which, when once taken, could never be recalled, were the great characteristics of the institution at a later day, and probably were productive of the worst evils which grew out of the system.

In another letter of Jerome, addressed to the virgin Principia, and giving an account of the piety of Marcella, a noble widow of Rome, who was the first, through his advice, to profess herself a follower of the monastic institution in that city, he states as follows: "At this time," saith he, "none of the noble ladies of Rome knew any thing of the monastic life, nor did they dare to assume the name, because it was then a new thing, discreditable and vile in the eyes of the people. The bishops of Alexandria, Athanasius, and afterwards Peter, obliged to fly from the persecution raised against them by the

Arian heretics, came to Rome, having learned the history of the blessed Anthony who was still living, and that of the monasteries established in Egypt by Pachomius, with the discipline of the widows and virgins. Nor did they blush to acknowledge what they had known to be acceptable to Christ. It was several years afterwards, before Sophronia and others imitated the example." Here then, brethren, we have the rise of this whole institution clearly referred to the fourth century, and therefore, in Jerome's own time, it was confessedly a novelty.

The shape which piety soon began to assume under the influence of this new institution, accommodated itself with the utmost readiness to the principles of penance and austerity, which the oriental philosophy engrafted on the Gospel. And hence we find the distinguished saints, whom the Church of Rome has thought fit to honour by a place in her calendar, are described, with very few exceptions, as having devoted themselves to celibacy, to poverty, and to a life of the most cruel and unceasing mortification. The history of these saints which modern Roman Catholics are most willing to acknowledge, may be found in the Roman Breviary, and the work of the Rev. Alban Butler, in which the sagacious author has omitted the most extravagant parts of the old chronicles, as being rather too strong for the taste of the nineteenth century. From these I shall extract a few specimens, which will clearly show the character of the system.

St. Macarius the younger, spent upwards of 60 years in the deserts of Upper Egypt, in the exercise of fervent penance and contemplation. He lived some time under St. Anthony, but aimed, if possible, at still greater perfection. As an instance of his austerities, it is related, that he passed the whole season of Lent, forty days and nights, standing in a corner, making baskets of palm-leaves, without eating any thing except a few raw cabbage-leaves on Sundays. At another time he hap-

pened inadvertently to kill a gnat, which was biting him in his cell, but reflecting that he had thus lost the opportunity of suffering that mortification, he hastened from his cell to the marshes of Scete, which abounded with a sort of flies, whose stings are insupportable even to wild boars. There he continued six months exposed to these insects, and to such a degree was his whole body disfigured in consequence, by sores and swellings, that when he returned he was only to be known by his voice. (Butler's Lives, Vol. I. 55.)

Another of these saints was St. Simeon Stylites, who was a subject of astonishment, not only to the Roman empire, but to many barbarous and infidel nations. In his tender youth he was taken into a monastery, where he made it his practice to eat once only in the week, and that on Sundays. The rough rope made of twisted palm-leaves, which they used for drawing water, seemed to him to be a fit instrument of penance; and therefore he tied it round his body and kept it there, until it had eaten into his flesh, and was cut out with the greatest anguish. After his recovery, he resolved that he would keep the whole of Lent without either eating or drinking, and actually did so for the following forty years. He remained in a hermitage three years, then built himself an inclosure of stones, without a roof, on the top of a mountain, fastening his leg to the rock with a great iron chain. But being too much distracted from his contemplation by the crowds of people that came from all parts to receive his blessing, he erected a pillar of nine feet high, on which he remained four years. On a second, eighteen feet high, he lived three years. On a third pillar, thirty-three feet high, he continued ten years; and on a fourth, built for him by the people, of sixty feet high, he spent the last twenty years of his life. His pillar was only three feet in diameter at the top, so that he could not lie down on it, neither would he allow himself a seat. Twice a day, he exhorted the people. His garments were the skins of beasts,

and he wore an iron collar round his neck. But he never suffered any woman to come within the enclosure where his pillar stood. His miracles were said to be very numerous, and the attraction of his singular mode of life was beyond example. (Ib. 65.)

A third instance is that of St. Jerome's particular friend Paula, who, after the death of her husband, resolved to devote herself to penance and devotion. She abstained from all flesh, meat, fish, eggs, honey, and wine; used oil only on holy days, lay on a stone floor covered with sackcloth, renounced all visits and amusements, put aside all costly garments, and gave all she had to the poor. Prayer, pious reading and fasting were her occupations, and finally she left her children at Rome, took up her abode at Bethlehem, built several monasteries, and passed the rest of her days in mortification. (Ib. 78.)

Another example is that of St. Paul: not the apostle, indeed, whose life was of a very opposite description, but St. Paul, the first Christian hermit. This man fled into the desert from the Decian persecution in A. D. 250, and chose for his dwelling a cave, near to which were a palm-tree and a clear spring. The leaves of the tree furnished him with clothing, the fruit with food, and the spring supplied him with water. Thus he lived for 21 years, and from that time till his death, about 70 years after, he was miraculously fed by a raven, who brought him half a loaf of bread every day. He was found dead by St. Anthony, another celebrated hermit, after he had paid him a visit by revelation; and although dead, the body was on the knees, and the hands stretched out as if in prayer. St. Anthony was greatly at a loss to know how he should bury the body, because he had no proper instruments for digging a grave. But two immense lions came up, and tearing up the ground, made a hole large enough for the purpose; then, making evident signs of mourning for Paul, and licking the feet of Antho-

ny, they went quietly away. (Ib. 103, and also St. Jerome's Life of Paul, Tom. I.)

We may next turn to the case of St. Germanus, bishop of Auxerre in the fifth century, who separated from the society of his wife, distributed all his property to the Church and the poor, and embraced a life of poverty and austerity. Until the day of his death, for 30 years together, he never touched wheaten bread, wine, vinegar, oil, pulse or salt. He began every meal by putting a little ashes into his mouth, to renew the spirit of penance, and took no other sustenance than barley bread, made of grain which he threshed and ground with his own hands. He never ate oftener than once a day, sometimes once in three days, often only once a week. His dress was mean, the same in summer and winter, and he always wore a hair shirt next his skin. His bed was strewed with ashes, without a bolster, and covered with sackcloth and a single blanket. He washed the feet of the poor, and served them with his own hands, while he himself was fasting. (Ib. 238.)

The founder of the famous order of the Jesuits, St. Ignatius, is one of the most glorious of these saints, in the estimation of the Church of Rome, as might naturally be expected. Of him it is related, that through the week he always fasted on bread and water, but on Sundays he added a few boiled herbs, sprinkled over with ashes. He wore an iron girdle, a hair shirt, and lay on the ground; and his acts of austerity were carried to the highest possible point of endurance, if not, indeed, far beyond it. (Ib. 260.)

St. Clare was another saint, who instituted an order of nuns in the 12th century. She wore neither shoes nor stockings, lay on the ground, observed a perpetual abstinence, and never spoke but when obliged by charity or necessity. She always wore next her skin a rough garment, made of bristles. Sometimes, considering the ground too pleasant a resting place, she strewed it all over with twigs, and placed a

wooden block for her bolster. She was afflicted with continual diseases and pains for eight and twenty years, yet would allow herself no other indulgence than a little straw to lie on. (Ib. 302.)

In the biography of St. Martin it is said, that near the time of his death he had a fever: nevertheless, he spent the night in prayer, lying on ashes and hair cloth. His disciples intreated him to allow at least a little straw under him. But he replied: It becomes not a Christian to die otherwise than upon ashes. I shall have sinned if I leave you any other example. (Ib. 65.)

These instances, however, are exceedingly mutilated, when compared with the full accounts of the original records; because the writer of the book, as I mentioned, omitted designedly all that he conceived likely to shock and disgust the taste of the age. I shall therefore, in order to give you a full picture, brethren, be obliged to have recourse to a less fastidious authority, but the most unquestionable, namely, the Roman breviary, and that too, in its most improved form.

Thus, in the life of St. Patrick, (Brev. Rom. Pars Verna, p. 501,) we read the following account of his devotional exercises, in the lessons appointed for the 17th of March, commonly called St. Patrick's day. "They say that he was wont to repeat daily the whole Psalter, together with the Canticles, and two hundred hymns and prayers; three hundred times on each day to worship God on his knees, and in each canonical hour of the day, to sign himself one hundred times with the sign of the cross. Dividing the night into three portions, he spent the first in running through one hundred psalms, and in two hundred genuflexions; the second, in running through the other fifty psalms, immersed in cold water, with his heart, eyes, and hands raised to heaven. But the third part he gave to a slight slumber upon the bare stone."

There was a saint placed in the calendar of the Church of

Rome so lately as the year 1830, only thirteen years ago, by the name of Alphonso Maria de Ligorio, of whose austerities and self-inflicted penances his confessor gave the following account to the pope:—"I know for a certainty," saith the confessor, "that this servant of God constantly scourged himself unbloodily and bloodily, and besides the unbloody scourgings enjoined by the rule of his order, he was wont to punish himself every day in the morning before the usual hour of rising, and in the evening after the signal for repose. On Saturdays he scourged himself till the blood flowed, and these scourgings were so violent, and caused so much blood to gush from his limbs, that not only was his linen always covered with it, but you might see even the walls of his small room stained, and the very books which he kept were sprinkled with it."

"And further, from what I have seen with my own eyes," continues the confessor, "and have heard declared by certain fathers who are worthy of credit, I know that this servant of God macerated his body with hair-cloth containing sharp points, and with chains as well on his arms as on his legs, which he carried with him till dinner time, and these were for the most part so armed with sharp points, that they filled with horror all who ever saw them. I have heard say, also, that he had a dress filled with a coat of mail with iron points, that he had bandages of camel's hair, and other instruments of penance were casually seen by me and by others of my companions, notwithstanding his zealous and circumspect secrecy." (Finch, Vol. I. 266.)

One example more, brethren, shall close this list of distressing self-tormentors, and that is the instance of St. Rose or Rosa, a nun of the Tertian order of St. Dominick, at Lima, who was canonized by pope Clement X., A.D. 1673, since the Reformation. The account was published at Rome in the collection of the Constitutions of Canonization, in the early part of the last century, and is as follows:—

“When St. Rose was still a little child, and ignorant of the use of whips, she changed the stones and crosses with which, when going to prayer, her maid Marianne used to load her, into iron chains, which she prepared as scourges, with which, after the example of St. Dominick, she offered herself every night, a bloody victim to God, to avert his just anger, even to the copious effusion of streams of blood, either for the sorrows of the holy Church, or for the necessities of the endangered kingdom, or of the city of Lima, or for compensating the wrongs of sinners, or for making an expiation for the souls of the dead, or for obtaining divine aid for those who were in their last agonies; the servants being sometimes horror-struck at such dreadful blows of the chains. And when the use of these was forbidden her, she privately encircled her waist with one of them bound three times around her, so that it never was apparent that she wore it, except when she was under the tortures of the sciatica. Lest any part of her innocent body should be free from suffering, she tortured her arms and limbs with penal chains, and stuffed her breast and sides full, with handfuls of nettles and small briars. She increased the sharpness of the hair-cloth, which reached from her neck beneath her knees, by needles mixed up with it, which she used for many years, until she was ordered to put it off on account of the frequent vomiting of blood. When she laid this aside, however, she substituted another garment, less injurious to her health, but not less troublesome, for beneath it every movement gave her pain. From these sufferings, in order that her feet might not be free, she either hit them with sharp stones, or burned them in an oven, that they might have their share of torture. Upon her head she fixed a tin crown with sharp nails in it, and for some years never put it on without being wounded. When she grew older, this was replaced by one which was armed with ninety-nine points.”

“As to her bed, she desired that the hardness of it should

drive away rather than invite sleep, so that it should also serve as an instrument of torture. Her pillow was either an unpolished trunk, or stones concealed for that purpose, and she filled her bed with sharp pieces of tiles and triangular fragments of broken jugs, disposed in such a manner that the sharp points should be next her body; nor did she try to sleep until she had embittered her mouth with a draught of gall." (Finch, Vol. I. p. 266.)

Here, brethren, we have a full length portrait of that astonishing and cruel superstition, of which celibacy was only a part, and monasticism was the completion; but which, instead of tracing its derivation from the pure Gospel of Christ, plainly descended from the practices of the ancient Gymnosophists, brought into the Church through the Gnostic heretics, and finding no parallel but with the Hindoo penances of the present day. But of such saints the Roman calendar is full. There is not a day in the year that is not dedicated to them. The miracles attributed to them are innumerable: and their power with God seems always to be computed by the measure of their voluntary torments. Numerous and strange are the accounts of their conflicts with Satan, and their victories over his arts, chiefly by making the sign of the cross. And it is common to find their devotions represented to be so fervent, that they were lifted up from the earth, remained suspended in the air, and had their countenances irradiated with a divine glory.

Of the miracles related of the saints, a volume might be compiled, which would at least excite astonishment if it did not produce edification. A very few must suffice us, for our time is nearly exhausted.

St. Raymund, of Pennafort, is related to have visited the island of Majorca with the king, in the year 1256, where he had occasion to rebuke the monarch for his licentiousness. Not finding any reformation follow the rebuke, he asked per-

mission to leave the island, and return to his convent at Barcelona. But this the king not only refused, but forbid any one to convey him out of the island under penalty of death. Upon this the saint, full of confidence in the Deity, said to his companion, 'A king of the earth endeavours to deprive us of the means of retiring, but the King of heaven will supply them.' He then walked boldly to the sea shore, extended his cloak upon the waves, tied up one corner of it to his staff for a sail, and having made the sign of the cross, stepped upon it without fear, whilst his companion stood trembling and wondering on the beach. "In this new kind of vessel," continues the historian, "he was wafted with such rapidity, that in six hours he reached the harbour of Barcelona, sixty leagues distant," being at the rate of about thirty miles an hour. (Butler's Lives, I. p. 133.)

We are told in another part of the history of the saints, that the veil worn by St. Agatha, and taken out of her tomb for that purpose, had several times driven back the torrent of burning lava which issued from Mount Ætna, and threatened to overwhelm the city of Catana. The relics of St. Januarius are confidently said to have frequently saved the city of Naples from the same fate, during the eruptions of Mount Vesuvius. (Ib. Vol. II. p. 411.)

The five wounds of St. Francis are another instance of a very peculiar kind. For after the saint had been favoured with a vision of Christ, or, as some of those writers seem to consider it, after he had been *transformed into Christ*, his body was found to have received the image of a crucifix. His hands and his feet seemed bored in the middle with four wounds, and the holes seemed to be pierced with nails of hard flesh. The heads were round and black, and appeared beyond the skin on the other side, and were there turned back as if clenched with a hammer. There was also in his side a

red wound, like one made by the piercing of a lance. (Ib. 457.)

An example of miracles occurs in the case of St. Rose, the same already mentioned, which is thus related:—"On her death-bed she invited the inanimate plants, after an unheard-of fashion, to praise and to pray to God, pronouncing the verse, 'Bless the Lord, all ye things which bud on the earth:' and she so visibly persuaded them, that the tops of the trees touched the earth, as if adoring their Creator." (Finch, Vol. I. 268.)

But perhaps all these cases yield to the example recorded by Baronius, (Vol. XIII. p. 512) when six of the monks who belonged to the order of preaching friars, were beheaded by the command of the Count of Thoulouse, the protector of the Albigensian heretics. But behold, after they were dead, the whole six took up their own heads, and carried them straight-way to the convent, a light sent from heaven going before each one.

"The same wonder occurred," remarks Baronius, "to Dionysius, the Areopagite, at Paris, and to Proculus, at Bononia, who carried their own heads, by a miracle, to a considerable distance from the place where they had been cut off; thus furnishing to the world not only a proof of their innocence, but also of the truth of that faith for which they suffered." Multitudes of such narratives are scattered through the writings of the Church of Rome, some far more preposterous than any I have mentioned; for my desire is not to provoke a smile at those superstitions, which ought rather to inspire us with commiseration, but to particularize those facts alone which are necessary to a fair development of principles, and thereby attain to a correct estimate of the necessity, the importance, and the actual results of the Reformation.

At this point in our course, then, brethren, let us pause to survey the spectacle presented by the Church of Rome, which

calls herself, remember, unchanged and unchangeable, the infallible preserver of the truth taught by the apostles. Yet she abrogates the marriage of the clergy, which the Word of God had expressly approved; she takes away the liberty which the Lord had established for his ministry, and puts her own restrictions in its place; she introduces a new order of the laity founded on the principles of celibacy, retirement from the world, and mortification, which had its model in heathenism and not in Christ or his apostles; she exalts her own new rule of celibacy as high above marriage as gold is above silver; she sets up a new kind of holiness and virtue, in the cruel scourgings, and chains, and fastings, by which her admired saints obtained such distinction, not one item of which can be found in the life of Christ or his apostles, or any of the holy men recorded in the Scriptures; she grants to her popes the privilege of declaring who of these saints shall be canonized, and thus be publicly set forth as worthy to receive prayers and offerings. She undertakes not only to tell us of the miracles which these saints performed in their life-time, but to assure us that their relics and their very garments can stop the raging pestilence, extinguish the devouring flame, and arrest the torrent of the burning lava. She warns her people of the danger to be incurred by their reading of the Bible, while she prepares the lives of these saints for general circulation, puts them in her breviary, and commends them as the great examples of holiness to every soul of her communion; and while it can be distinctly shown that neither clerical celibacy, nor the monastic system, nor retirement to religious solitude, nor self-inflicted penances, nor abstinence from all the common comforts of life, nor irrevocable vows, nor holiness founded upon austerity, had become engrafted upon the Gospel of Christ, until several hundred years after the apostolic day; nevertheless, the Church of Rome gravely reiterates her assertion, that she is *unchanged*

and infallible, and asks us *what cause there was for the Reformation?*

It is indeed true, however, that an awkward attempt has been often made to justify the monastic system by the examples of John the Baptist, Elijah and Elisha, the sons of the prophets, and the family of Jonadab, the son of Rechab; (Hieron. ad Paulinum, de Instit. Mon. Op. om. Tom. I. p. 67, C. D.) not one of which, as it is easy to prove, can yield to it the slightest support or semblance of authority. But the simple and the conclusive argument is derived from the great principle of the Gospel, that the Word of Christ is our rule, and the life of Christ, so far as our circumstances make it applicable, and especially as it is illustrated by his apostles, is our example. Hence the precept of St. Paul, "Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ," furnishes, at once, the law and the commentary. And every attempt to introduce a higher, a stricter, or a more expedient rule, not only involves the peril of religious truth, but is sure to prove, in the end, how far the wisdom of God excels the inventions of men.

The doctrine of celibacy and the institution of the monastic system, brethren, furnish, on this very point, the most instructive lessons. Nothing could be more corrupt, nothing more debased, nothing more licentious, than the morals of the clergy and the lives of the monks generally became, from the period of their complete establishment to the time of the Reformation. And although it gives me pleasure to say, that since that glorious Reformation, the morals of the Roman priesthood, and the character of the monastic and conventual institutions, in all those countries where the reformed religion is known, are as pure and blameless as those of other Christians, yet historical truth compels us to attribute the improvement, not to the efficacy of celibacy or monachism, *considered in themselves*, but to the watchfulness made necessary by the neighbourhood of opposing sects, the higher tone of public sentiment, and the

greater diffusion of knowledge and intelligence throughout the mass of the community.

The influence of the Reformation is likewise manifest on the whole process of superior sanctity, as carried on in the darker ages. The lives of the saints prepared by Rev. Alban Butler for modern use, and from which I have made the greater part of my extracts, is quite a moderate and rational set of biographies, when compared with the original documents themselves. The cruel penances, the bloody scourgings, and the more extravagant and puerile miracles, are either omitted altogether, or so softened down, as to present a very different and assuredly much more creditable history; although enough still remains of the characteristic error to make it a dangerous book to a young and ardent mind. This emendation also is a fruit of the Reformation. Enlightened Roman Catholics themselves cannot believe the mass of venerable superstitions and absurdities which their own records furnish; and hence the universal and increasing disposition among them—thank God!—to reduce the credit of the saints, to say comparatively but little about their miracles and merits, to cast a mantle of kindly oblivion over their austerities, and to preach and to write more and more in accordance with the simple and only effective doctrines of the everlasting Gospel.

Our next lecture, brethren, will present that doctrine of the Church of Rome which stands in direct connexion with our last subject, namely, the worship, or veneration, as it is now more frequently called, of the virgin Mary and the saints. And as it will require but a few more lectures to carry us through our intended course, I trust you will feel sufficient interest in them to continue your attention. After all, my beloved brethren, what ought to engage us more earnestly, next to the securing our own hope in Christ, than the condition of that Church, which not only unites so many claims of antiquity, of former power, and of historical importance, but

which numbers, in our own day, so vast a proportion of the Christian world, and is steadily gaining ground in our own country? How grateful should we be to the providence of that gracious God, who dissipated the darkness which brooded over Europe before the sixteenth century, and who has so ordered our own lot, that we enjoy the utmost allowance of Scriptural light and Gospel liberty! And how deeply concerned and affectionately solicitous should we be for the increase of the same light and liberty, amongst that immense portion of the Christian family, who are yet clinging so fondly to their errors under the mistaken notion of infallibility, and who, although they know it not, are dependent upon the very Reformation which they despise, for the comparative purity, moderation and peace of their practical system. Let us then cherish more and more, the spirit of love towards them, and towards every other division of the Universal or Catholic Church. Not the weak and foolish love which is blind to every fault, and deaf to every suggestion of error; but the true Christian love which strikes to benefit, which rebukes to instruct, which wounds to heal. And may the prayer of faith and charity rise upwards on the wings of hope, that the mighty power of the Holy Spirit may reduce the conflicting elements of modern religion into harmony and order, that infidelity and superstition may alike submit to the Word of God, and the whole earth be filled with his glory.

LECTURE XI.

THE APOCALYPSE, xxii. 8, 9.—And after I had heard and seen, I fell down to adore before the feet of the angel who showed me these things, And he said unto me : See thou do it not : for I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them who keep the words of the prophecy of this book : Adore God. (Doway version.)

THE subject appointed for the following lecture, my brethren, will again bring us into communication with Dr. Wiseman, from whom I have been obliged to depart for two lectures past, because the important matters discussed in them, namely, the doctrine of anathema and persecution, and the system of celibacy, penance and mortification, which form the essential elements of sanctification in the Church of Rome, are totally passed by in his course, either because he thought that even his ingenuity could not give them an acceptable aspect to an English audience, or because he concluded that the less there was said about them, the better. But on the veneration and worship of the angels, the virgin Mary, and the saints, our author is strong and eloquent, and therefore I shall quote from his volumes, as I have done before.

“The Catholic doctrine,” saith he, “regarding the saints, is twofold. In the first place, it teaches that the saints of God make intercession before him for their brethren on earth. In the second place, it teaches that it is lawful to invoke their intercession : knowing that they do pray for us, we say it must be lawful to turn to them, and ask and entreat of them

to use that influence which they possess, in interceding on our behalf." (Vol. II. p. 80.)

"If you ask a Catholic," continues our author, "what he means by the communion of saints, he tells you at once, that he understands by it an interchange of good offices between the saints in heaven, and those who are fighting here below for their crown, whereby they intercede on their part on our behalf, look down on us with sympathy, take an interest in all that we do and suffer, and make use of the influence they necessarily possess with God, towards assisting their frail and tempted brethren on earth. And to balance all this, we have our offices towards them, inasmuch as we repay them in respect, admiration and love, with the feeling that those who were once our brethren, having run their course, and being in possession of their reward, we may turn to them in the confidence of brethren, and ask them to use that influence with their Lord and Master which their charity and goodness necessarily move them to exert." (P. 81.)

Proceeding to show how this idea is founded upon the doctrine, that the departed saint cannot have forgotten his personal associates when he leaves this world, our author asks the question: "Who will for a moment imagine—who can for an instant entertain the thought, that the child which has been snatched from its parent by having been taken from a world of suffering, does not continue to love her whom it has left on earth, and sympathize with her sorrows over its grave? Who can believe that when friend is separated from friend, and when one expires in the prayer of hope, their friendship is not continued, and that the two are not united in the same warm affection which they enjoyed here below? And if it was the privilege of love on earth—if it was one of the holiest duties, to pray to the Almighty for him who was so perfectly beloved—can we suppose that this holiest, most beautiful and most perfect duty of charity, hath ceased in heaven? Can we

believe that God would deprive charity of its highest prerogative, when he has given it its brightest crown?" (Ib. 82, 83.)

Our author passes on from this eloquent interrogation to exhibit some Scriptural evidence on this branch of the argument. "We have the plainest and strongest assurances," saith he, "that God does receive the prayers of the saints and the angels, and that they are constantly employed in supplications on our behalf. For we have the belief of the universal Jewish Church, confirmed in the new law. The belief of the old law is clear, for we find that the angels are spoken of constantly as in a state of ministration over the wants and necessities of mankind. In the book of Daniel, for instance, we read of angels sent to instruct him, and we have mention made of the princes, meaning the angels of different kingdoms.—Our Saviour speaks of this as a thing well understood—'Even so,' saith he, 'there shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons that need no repentance.'—We are elsewhere told that the saints of God shall be like his angels. We have also the angels of individuals spoken of, and we are told not to offend any of Christ's little ones, or make them fall, because their angels always see the face of their Father who is in heaven.—But in the Apocalypse, we have still stronger authority, for we there read of our prayers as being perfumes in the hands of angels and saints. One blessed spirit stood before a mystical altar in heaven, having a golden censer, and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar, which is before the throne of God. And the smoke of the incense of the prayers of the saints ascended up before God, from the hand of the angel. And not only the angels but the twenty-four elders, cast themselves before the throne of God, and pour out vials of sweet odours, which are the prayers of the saints." (Ib. p. 83, 4, 5.)

“From all this,” continues Dr. Wiseman, “it is proved that the saints and angels know what passes on earth, that they are aware of what we do and suffer, that they actually present our prayers to God and intercede in our behalf with him. Here then is a basis, and a sufficient one for our belief; that prayers are offered for us by the saints, and therefore that we may apply to them for their supplications.” (Ib. 85.)

In these quotations, brethren, we see a specimen of the whole system of the Church of Rome, which, beginning in truth, goes on with inference after inference, until the result becomes a dangerous error. The communion of saints, the fact that the departed spirit continues to love and pray for its individual friends and family; that the angels are ministering spirits sent forth, as St. Paul declares, to minister to those that shall be heirs of salvation; that through the intelligence given by these ministering angels, the departed saints are probably informed of all that interests them on earth, and that the progress and prosperity of the whole Church, as well as the happiness of their individual friends, are the constant subject of their supplications; that in heaven, the four and twenty elders, with the cherubim, offer up golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints, and that the communion of the whole is thus sustained in affection, sympathy, and supplication for us by the departed saints, and in love, and remembrance, and desire to enjoy their society on our part, below—all this we grant and believe as fully as the Church of Rome, because we have the testimony of the Word of God in its favour. On this true basis, however, they have erected a lofty structure of superstition, and I fear I must add, impiety, in no part of which can we discern any real authority of Scripture or right reason. We deny utterly, therefore, the inference of Dr. Wiseman, that because we believe the departed saints remember and pray for us, therefore it is right that we should pray to them. We

deny that there is any knowledge or power in the Church on earth to pronounce upon the salvation, much less upon the glorification of any particular saint. We may hope and trust, and feel a happy persuasion of their bliss, but the Lord alone can pronounce an authoritative judgment. We also deny that the angels are to be worshipped or addressed in prayer, and the whole mass of worship established by the Church of Rome in honour of the virgin Mary and the saints, we hold ourselves prepared to prove to be unscriptural, unknown to the primitive Church, and utterly unfavourable to the best interests of the gospel.

These are strong assertions, brethren, but not stronger, I trust, than the evidence will fully justify. I should not undertake, however, to prove the correctness of our doctrine, if I were confined to Dr. Wiseman's statement of the other side. He tells us, indeed, that the Church of Rome thinks it right to apply to the departed saints for the benefit of their supplications; but he does not inform us how the application is made, what sort of power is attributed to the saints, and in what terms of honour, praise, and invocation, this portion of their worship is conducted. These defects I must supply in the first place, by setting before you a pretty copious selection from the standard books of the Church of Rome, and then, brethren, you will be prepared to understand the importance of this portion of our controversy.

To begin, then, with the virgin Mary: the catechism of the Council of Trent declares that "she is truly and properly called Mother of God and man," and 'Immaculate,' that is, without spot or stain, (p. 47.) As the apostles sometimes call Jesus Christ the second Adam, so "the virgin mother we may also," continues this catechism, "compare to Eve."—"By believing the serpent, Eve entailed malediction and death upon mankind; and Mary, by believing the angel, became the instrument of the divine goodness in bringing life and benediction to

the human race. From Eve we are born children of wrath, from Mary we have received Jesus Christ, and through him are regenerated children of grace. To Eve it was said, in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children: Mary was exempt from this law, for preserving her integrity inviolate, she brought forth Jesus the Son of God without experiencing any sense of pain." (Ib. 49.)

In another part of this catechism, on the subject of prayer, we read as follows: "To the duty of thanksgiving belongs the first part of the angelical salutation. When we say by way of prayer: 'Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou among women;' we render to God the highest praise and return him most grateful thanks, because he accumulated all his heavenly gifts on the most holy virgin; and to the virgin herself, for this her singular felicity, we present our respectful and fervent congratulations. To this form of thanksgiving the Church of God has wisely added prayer to, and an invocation of, the most holy mother of God, by which we piously and humbly fly to her patronage, in order that, by interposing her intercession, she may conciliate the friendship of God to us miserable sinners, and may obtain for us those blessings which we stand in need of in this life, and the life to come. Exiled children of Eve, who dwell in this vale of tears, should we not earnestly beseech the mother of mercy, the advocate of the faithful, to pray for us? Should we not earnestly implore her help and assistance? That she possesses exalted merits with God, and that she is most desirous to assist us by her prayers, it were wicked and impious to doubt." (Ib. 435.)

To have a distinct idea, brethren, of the quality of the worship thus enjoined, we must look at the language which the Church of Rome puts into the mouth of the worshipper.

Thus the angelical salutation, or Hail Mary, as it is often called, is as follows:

“Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Holy Mary, *mother of God*, pray for us sinners, now, and in the hour of our death. Amen.” (True Piety, p. 23-4. New York edition of 1826.)

We may next cite the language of their confession.

“I confess to Almighty God, to blessed Mary, ever a virgin, to blessed Michael the archangel, to blessed John the Baptist, to the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and to all the saints, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought word and deed, through my fault, through my most grievous fault. Therefore I beseech the blessed Mary ever a virgin, the blessed Michael the archangel, the blessed John the Baptist, the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and all the saints, to pray to the Lord our God for me.” (Ib. 24.)

The invocation of the virgin, the guardian angel, and the patron saint, enjoined on every worshipper, is as follows:

“O holy virgin, mother of God! my advocate and patroness! pray for thy poor servant, prove thyself a mother to me. And thou, O blessed spirit, my guardian angel, whom God in his mercy hath appointed to watch over me, intercede for me this day, that I may not stray from the paths of virtue. Our glorious apostle St. Patrick, and thou, also, O happy saint, whose name I bear, pray for me that I may serve God faithfully in this life as thou hast done, and with thee glorify him eternally in heaven. Amen.” (Ib. p. 25.)

From the Litany of the blessed virgin, I shall next extract some of the prayers and titles addressed to her.

“We fly to thy patronage, O holy mother of God, despise not our petitions in our necessities, but deliver us from all dangers, O ever glorious and blessed virgin.”

“*Holy mother of God, mother of divine grace, mother of our Creator, most powerful Virgin, most merciful Virgin, mirror of justice—*pray for us. *Seat of wisdom, cause of our*

joy, Tower of David, House of Gold, Ark of the covenant, Gate of heaven, Morning Star, Health of the weak, Refuge of sinners, Comforter of the afflicted, Help of Christians, Queen of angels, Queen of patriarchs, Queen of prophets, Queen of apostles, Queen of martyrs, Queen of confessors, Queen of virgins, Queen of all saints,—pray for us.” (Ib. 38-9.)

Here is a marvellous collection of glorious titles, brethren, to offer to any creature; but perhaps there is still more force in the following prayer.

“O blessed Virgin, mother of God: and by this august quality worthy of all respect from men and angels, I come to offer thee *my most humble homage*, and to implore the aid of thy prayers and *protection*. *Thou art all powerful with the Almighty*, and thy *goodness* for mankind is *equal to thy influence in heaven*. Thou knowest, O blessed Virgin! that from my tender years I looked up to thee as my mother, my advocate and patroness: thou wert pleased to consider me, from that time, as one of thy children, and *whatever graces I have received from God*, I confess with humble gratitude *that it is through thee I receive them*. Why was I not as faithful in thy service, as thou wert bountiful in assisting me! But I will henceforth *serve, honour and love thee*. Accept, O blessed Virgin, my *protestations of fidelity*; look favourably on the confidence I have in thee; obtain for me, of thy dear Son, a lively faith, a firm hope, a tender, generous, and constant love. Obtain for me a purity that nothing can soil, a humility that nothing can elate, a patient submission to the will of God, that nothing can ever disturb. In fine, O glorious Virgin, obtain for me so faithful an imitation of thy virtue in my life, that I may experience the power of thy protection at my death. Amen.” (Ib. 180.)

A little farther on in this authoritative book of Roman Catholic devotion, we find what is called a “*Consecration of one’s self to the blessed Virgin.*”

“Holy Mary, virgin mother of God, *I this day choose thee for my mother, queen, patroness and advocate*, and firmly resolve never to depart either by word or action from the duty I owe thee, or suffer those committed to my charge to say or do any thing against thy honour. *Receive me therefore as thy servant for ever, assist me in all the actions of my whole life*, and forsake me not in the hour of my death. Amen.” (Ib. 182-3.)

After this follows the “prayer of St. Bernard to the blessed Virgin.”

“Remember, O most pious virgin, that it is unheard of, through all ages, that any one who had recourse to thee, implored thy aid, and begged the assistance of thy prayers, ever was forsaken. Animated with the same confidence, I fly to thee, O virgin of virgins, mother of my God! I come to thee and *cast myself at thy feet, a wretched sinner*, groaning and weeping. O mother of the eternal Word, despise not this my humble supplication, but graciously hear and mercifully grant my request.” (Ib. 183.)

In the introduction to another form in this same book of devotion, namely, the Rosary of the blessed virgin, the prayer called Hail Mary, is commended in these words: “It was composed in heaven, dictated by the Holy Ghost, and delivered to the faithful by the angel Gabriel, St. Elizabeth, and the Church of Christ.” And afterwards we find that in this Rosary, for every single repetition of the Lord’s prayer, it is ordered that the prayer to the Virgin shall be said *ten times*; from which we learn that the supplications addressed to her in this favourite form of devotion, are beyond all reasonable allowance, more frequent than those made to the Almighty. (Ib. 275.)

The third part of this Rosary presents to the worshipper what is called the fourth and fifth glorious mysteries, being there placed in company with the resurrection and ascension

of Christ, and the descent of the Holy Spirit. The following are the words of the fourth mystery :—

“Let us contemplate, in this mystery, how the glorious virgin Mary, after the resurrection of her son, passed out of this world unto him, and was by him assumed into heaven, accompanied by the holy angels.” Then follows the prayer: (Ib. 285.)

“O most prudent virgin, who, entering into the heavenly palace, didst fill the holy angels with joy and man with hope, vouchsafe to intercede for us in the hour of death, that, free from the illusions and temptations of the devil, we may joyfully and successfully pass out of this temporal state, to enjoy the happiness of eternal life. Amen.”

The fifth mystery is thus set forth under the title of—

“The Coronation of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary in Heaven.”

“Let us contemplate in this mystery how the glorious virgin Mary was, with great jubilee and exultation of the whole court of heaven, and particular glory of all the saints, crowned by her Son with the brightest diadem of glory.” After which there is another prayer :—

“O glorious queen of all the heavenly citizens, we beseech thee accept this Rosary, which, as a crown of roses, we offer at thy feet, and grant, most gracious lady, that by thy intercession, our souls may be inflamed with so ardent a desire of seeing thee so gloriously crowned, that it may never die in us, until it shall be changed into the happy fruition of thy blessed sight. Amen.”

“Hail! holy *queen, mother of mercy, our life, our sweetness, and our hope*, to thee do we cry, poor banished children of Eve: to thee do we send up our sighs, mourning and weeping, in this valley of tears. Turn, then, most gracious *advocate*, thine *eyes of mercy toward us*, and after this our exile is

ended, show unto us the blessed fruit of thy womb, Jesus, O clement, O pious, O sweet virgin Mary.”

These extracts from the worship which the Church of Rome has dictated to her people, brethren, contain but a small part of the devotion addressed to the virgin Mary. And I ask you, is it worship, or is it merely veneration and respect, as Dr. Wiseman would fain persuade us? Does not the whole strain and character of it place the virgin in the highest scale of authority? Is she not effectually made the most important object of the heart's affections, so that the sinner who secures her advocacy and patronage has nothing to fear? Does she not occupy the station of mother of the Divinity of Christ, rather than mother of his humanity, whose wishes are absolute, whose influence is omnipotent, and who, although she is not called indeed a goddess, nevertheless has the almighty power of God at her disposal? Nay, is not the Roman Catholic taught to regard Christ as *an infant* under the government and authority of his mother, not simply in their popular prints and pictures, but in some of their most solemn services? Let me appeal for my evidence to another and a most extraordinary set of devotions, drawn up for nine successive days, and for this reason called a *Novena*, and addressed to the *Infant Jesus*, as if the glorified Redeemer of the world WERE AN INFANT STILL. In this most singular piece of profanation, the Saviour is addressed by the title of *infant* fifty times. As thus: “Infant, Jesus Christ, have mercy upon us. Infant, Son of the living God—Infant, Son of the virgin Mary—Infant, strong in weakness—Infant, treasure of grace—have mercy upon us. From the malice of the world deliver us, O Infant Jesus. From the pride of life deliver us, O Infant Jesus;” and so of the rest. (Ib. 316.) What is the meaning of addressing Christ under this appellation, *Infant*, unless it be to aid in fixing upon the minds of the worshippers the controlling power and influence of his mother? And when we con-

sider that the epithet is applied to that glorious Saviour, who, eighteen centuries ago, ascended up to heaven in the full perfection of his divine person, both God and man—is it too much to say that such language is nothing better than downright impiety?

Another part of this sad corruption, brethren, consists in their doctrine, that the virgin Mary was perfectly pure, both from original and actual sin. And this is not only found frequently asserted in the service, called the office of the blessed virgin Mary, but there is at the end an anthem and prayer declaring the same, to the repetition of which pope Paul V. granted an hundred days of indulgence. A few extracts may be necessary to prove the fact. Thus, for instance, one of the appointed hymns addresses the virgin:

“Hail, ark of the Covenant
 King Solomon’s throne
 Bright rainbow of heaven
 The bush of vision.
 The fleece of Gideon
 The flowering rod
 Sweet honey of Samson
 Closet of God.
 Twas meet Son so noble
 Should save from stain
 Wherewith Eve’s children
 Spotted remain,
 The maid whom for mother
 He had elected
 That she might be never
 With sin infected.”—(Ib. p. 289.)

The poetry is none of the best, but that is a matter of no importance. The doctrine inculcated is the only point in question.

Another hymn from the same office, may exhibit the doctrine more plainly.

"Hail mother and virgin
 Of the Trinity
 Temple; joy of angels
 Seal of purity.
 Comfort of mourners
 Garden of pleasure
 Palm tree of patience
 Chastity's measure.
 Thou land sacerdotal
 Art blessed wholly
From sin original
Exempted solely."—(Ib. 290.)

The anthem and prayer which the pope distinguished by the one hundred days' indulgence, is as follows:

"This is the branch, in which was *neither knot of original, nor bark of actual sin found*. In thy conception, O virgin, thou wast *immaculate*. Pray unto the Father for us whose Son thou didst bring forth." And next follows the prayer:

"O God, who by the immaculate conception of the blessed virgin, didst prepare a fit habitation for thy Son, we beseech thee, that as by the foreseen death of her same Son, thou didst preserve her pure from all spot, so likewise grant, that we, by her intercession made free from sin, may attain unto thee, through our Lord Jesus Christ, thy Son, who with thee and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth, one God, world without end. Amen." (Ib. 294-5.)

Here, therefore, we perceive that the virgin Mary is declared not to have been a sinner, and therefore it results, that to her, Christ was not a Saviour, but only a Son. For Christ saith himself, that he came "not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. The whole need not the physician, but they that are sick." But, according to their doctrine, she needed no Saviour. Her humanity was as pure as his own, her claims of perfect obedience to the law of God as high, her right to the kingdom of heaven by her own merits as absolute. So that,

although the Church of Rome has indeed left uncorrupted the great articles of the Christian faith which concern the divinity, the incarnation, the spotless purity, the perfect obedience and the infinite merits of the Redeemer, yet she has brought forward, in the person of Mary, an object of faith and confidence as pure, as obedient, as meritorious and as powerful, but by reason of her sex, more compassionate and merciful, and therefore more ready to succour the sinner.

But let me pass from the subject of the virgin, for a while, in order to present a specimen of the devotion offered to the other saints and angels. Of the first, a prayer to St. Aloysius, united with Mary, will be perhaps sufficient.

“O glorious St. Aloysius, appointed by the Church of Christ as a worthy advocate for her children, intercede for me, obtain for me what I ask, if it be for the glory of God and the good of my soul. Or, at least, O faithful servant of God, direct my request, that it may turn to the honour of my dear and blessed Redeemer, that through thy patronage he may see in me the effect of his sacred passion and blood.”

“Omnipotent and eternal God of heaven and earth, who hast been pleased to adorn the ever glorious virgin Mary with the treasures of heaven, making her a fit habitation for thy divine Son, permit thy servant to offer to thee those virtues which rendered her most pleasing in thy sight; accept in my behalf her pure virginity, her perfect obedience and humility, her poverty and sufferings, together with the innocence, penance and perfect resignation of thy worthy St. Aloysius. I beseech thee grant me a true compunction of heart, give me a true spirit of mortification and humility, that I may despise all worldly things and rest in thee alone. Grant me my petition to thy great honour and glory.” (Ib. 256.) Here, brethren, the worshipper offers to God, not the atonement and merits of Christ, but the virtues, the perfect obedience, and sufferings of

the virgin, together with the innocence, penance, and resignation of St. Aloysius!

Somewhat of the like description we shall find in the prayer to a guardian angel. (Ib. 162.)

“O holy angel, to whose care, God, in his mercy, hath committed me, thou who assistest me in my wants, who consolest me in my afflictions, who supportest me when dejected, and who constantly obtainest for me new favours, I return thee now most sincere and humble thanks, and I conjure thee, O amiable guide, to continue still thy care, to defend me against my enemies, to remove from me the occasion of sin, to obtain for me a docility to thy holy inspirations, to protect me, in particular, at the hour of my death, and then conduct me to the mansions of eternal repose. Amen.” (Ib. 167.)

From the Litany of Saint Joseph, I quote a few sentences. “St. Joseph, the virgin consort of a virgin mother, pray for us. St. Joseph, ruler of the Lord of the Universe—St. Joseph, governor of the Incarnate Wisdom—St. Joseph, nursing father to him by whom all creatures live—St. Joseph, saviour of the Saviour of mankind—St. Joseph, honoured and served by the King and queen of heaven—St. Joseph, seated on a throne of glory near those of Jesus and Mary—pray for us.” (Ib. 172-3.)

What sort of epithets are these, brethren, to lavish on any mortal man? Does not the Church of Rome, in all this, pay the saints a worship as substantial and as true, if not quite as elevated, as any that they give to God himself? Hear what the great Bellarmine, one of their most learned and accomplished champions, acknowledges, when defending the propriety of making vows to the saints. “A vow,” saith he, “does not suit the saints,* unless inasmuch as they are *gods by participation*;

* *Votum non convenit sanctis, nisi quatenus sunt Dii per participationem.*

and we know for certain that *saints reigning with Christ are really such.*" (Philpot's Lett. to Butler, 33.) Here is an honest confession of the only doctrine that can justify such devotional forms as these, and although the name of gods is not currently given to them, yet I confess I do not see how they can be otherwise regarded than as a sort of inferior divinities, upon the Roman Catholic system.

But tedious as our extracts, I fear, have been, from the devotions of the Church of Rome to the virgin Mary, I must state a few additional circumstances in order to do justice to the true state of her worship at the present day. There are, then, be it noted, as many festivals to her honour, as to the honour of Christ himself. Besides the festival of her conception, there is one of her nativity, another of her presentation by her parents in the temple, and another of her assumption into heaven. A similarity, indeed, between her and our blessed Lord, is studiously affected. Not only is the assumption of her body into heaven made to parallel our Lord's ascension, but her body is stated, like his, to have been miraculously preserved from corruption. A whole week is devoted to the honour of that event, and on the fourth day a lesson is read, in which the narrative of Scripture on the subject of Christ is fairly left in the shade. Thus it runs: "At the time of her glorious falling asleep, all the apostles who were employed in their holy mission through the whole earth, for the salvation of mankind, were in a moment carried aloft through the air and brought together at Jerusalem. While they were there, they saw a vision of angels, and heard the hymns of the hosts of heaven, *and lo! with divine glory she delivered her soul into the hands of God.* But her body was taken amidst the songs of angels and of the apostles, and deposited in a coffin at Gethsemane, in which place the *melody of the angels continued for three days.* At the end of those days the apostles opened the tomb, to enable Thomas, who

alone had hitherto been absent, to fulfil a wish which he felt, to adore that body which had borne the Lord. On opening it, the body was no where to be found, but only the grave-clothes in which it had been wrapped, and from them issued an ineffable odour, pervading the atmosphere around. So wonderful and mysterious an event astonished the apostles, who could draw from it but one conclusion, that it had pleased the Word of God that her immaculate body, by which he was incarnate, should be preserved from corruption, and should be at once translated to heaven, without waiting for the general resurrection."

In the service of the next day is the following lesson: "But who is sufficient to conceive how glorious on this day was the progress of the queen of the world! With what transport of devout affection the whole multitude of the heavenly hosts went forth to meet her! With what hymns she was conducted to the throne of glory! With how placid, how serene an aspect, with what divine embraces she was received by her Son, and exalted above every creature,—with that honour which became the worth of so great a mother, and that glory which befitted so great a Son." (Philpot's Letters to Butler, 41, 42.)

"Providing in all things, therefore, and through all things, for the wretched, she consoles our fear, she excites our faith, she strengthens our hope, she drives away our distrust, she raises our pusillanimity. You feared to approach the Father; terrified at only hearing him, you fled among the trees; He has given Jesus Christ to you as a Mediator. What cannot such a Son obtain from such a Father? He will be heard for his own sake, for the Father loves the Son. *But perhaps you fear also in him the Divine Majesty*, because, though he was made man, he was still God. Do you desire to have an advocate with him? *Have recourse to Mary*.—She also will be heard *for her own sake*. For the Son will hear the

mother, and the Father will hear the Son." (Finch, Supplement, p. 186.)

But one set of extracts more, brethren, shall be imposed upon your patience, and that is taken from a form of devotion now used by the Roman Catholics of England, called the Devotion to the sacred heart of Mary; I transcribe it because I think it may be called the climax of this idolatry. It is as follows:

"As the adorable heart of Jesus was formed in the chaste womb of the blessed virgin, and of her blood and substance, so we cannot, in a more proper and agreeable manner, show our devotion to the sacred heart of the Son, than by dedicating some part of the said devotion to the ever pure heart of the mother. For you have two hearts here united in the most strict alliance and tender conformity of sentiments, so that it is not in nature to please the one, without making yourself agreeable to the other, and acceptable to both. Go then, devout client, go to the heart of Jesus, *but let your way be through the heart of Mary.*—Presume not to separate and divide two objects so intimately one or united together, but ask redress in all your exigencies from the heart of Jesus, *and ask this redress through the heart of Mary.*"

"This form and method of worship is the doctrine and very spirit of God's Church, it is what she teaches us in the unanimous voice and practice of the faithful, who will by no means that Jesus and Mary should be separated from each other in our prayers, praises, and affections." (Philpot's Letters to Butler, Sup. p. 387.)

"Come then, hardened and inveterate sinner, how great soever your crimes may be. Come and behold, Mary stretches out her hand, and opens her breast to receive you. Though insensible to the great concerns of your salvation, *though, unfortunately, proof against the most engaging invitations and inspirations of the Holy Ghost, fling yourself at the*

feet of this powerful advocate. Her throne, though exalted, has nothing forbidding, nothing dreadful: her heart is all love, all tenderness. If you have the least remains of confidence and reliance on her protection, doubt not she will carry you through her own blessed heart in the most speedy and favourable manner, to the truly merciful and most sacred heart of her Son, Jesus."

Here follows, brethren, what is called an angelical exercise:

"I reverence you, O sacred virgin Mary, the holy Ark of the Covenant, and together with all the good thoughts of good men upon the earth, and all the blessed spirits in heaven, do bless and praise you infinitely, for that you are the *great mediatrix between God and man*, obtaining for sinners *all that they can ask and demand of the blessed Trinity.*" (Ib. 388.)

Again: "I am the protectress of my servants, says the glorious mother of God. Give me your heart, my dear child, and if it be as hard as a flint, I will make it as soft as wax, and if it be more foul and loathsome than dirt, I will render it more clear and beautiful than crystal. My blessed servant Ignatius gave me one day power over his heart, and I did render it so chaste and strong, that he never after felt any motion of the flesh all his life. Give me your heart, my child, and tell me, in the sincerity of a true son, how much you love me, your chaste mother? Hail Mary."

"O my dear mother! I love you more than my tongue can express, and *more than my very soul can conceive.* And I reverence you, O sacred virgin Mary, and together with the Holy Trinity *bless and praise you infinitely*, for that you are *worthy of so many praises as none can, no, not yourself, conceive.* I praise and magnify you a thousand thousand times; and ten thousand times I bless that sacred womb of yours which bore the Son of the eternal Father. Hail Mary."

To wind up the whole, I add one out of many of the

various salutations and benedictions offered in this devotional book to the virgin: "Hail Mary, lady and mistress of the world, *to whom all power has been given both in heaven and in earth.*" (Ib. 392, 3.)

And now, brethren, what are we to think of the moderate statement of Dr. Wiseman, upon the veneration and invocation of the saints in the Church of Rome? Is not the charge of idolatry so often brought against her, unhappily but too well sustained? For while the only living and true God is indeed confessed, and the only Saviour and Mediator is acknowledged, and the only Holy Spirit is worshipped, in the fullest terms of orthodoxy, yet is there not a host of other mediators introduced, which must inevitably draw away the attention and devotion of the people, and especially is not the Virgin made the most prominent and efficient instrument of salvation?

The Roman Catholic, indeed, exclaims loudly against this charge of idolatry, because the virgin and the saints are not called gods, nor regarded as divine beings, in the same sense as the Creator, but as creatures deriving all their power and influence from the Almighty, who alone is the First and the Last, the eternal, living and true God. But there can be no greater error than to suppose, that we cannot commit idolatry unless we imagine the object of our devotion to be the uncreated Deity. The language of the first and second commandment is express upon the principle: "Thou shalt not have strange gods before me. Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above or in the earth beneath, nor of those things that are in the waters under the earth; thou shalt not adore them nor serve them. I am the Lord." (1 Exod. xx.) Here is the very case contemplated and expressly prohibited, the having, *along with*, or *before* the true and supreme God, other objects of worship and devotion, taken from the things of heaven and earth. The angels are worshipped by the Church of Rome, and here are *the things of heaven.*

The saints are worshipped, their images and their relics, and these are *the things of earth*. The commandment, therefore, forbids the creatures being worshipped *as creatures*, and by those who knew they were creatures; and with this agrees the description which St. Paul has recorded in the 1st ch. of his epistle to the Romans, where, speaking of the heathen, he saith, “that they worshipped the *creature more* than the Creator, who is blessed for ever.” If such were not the design of the great commandment of the law, it would have had no practical application. For it is worthy of great observation, that this is precisely the character of all idolatry—to take the creature and place it in the rank of divinity, only in a subordinate position to the supreme Deity. Is it not familiar to every well instructed child, that the Roman emperors were generally canonized by a decree of the senate, and were from that time counted among the gods? But did any of their worshippers think, for all that, of confounding them with the superior deities? Nay, were not these superior deities themselves believed to have been once human beings, who, on account of their great achievements, were taken into heaven? Here, then, was the very principle of idolatry, the giving or ascribing to creatures acknowledged to be such, a seat among the celestial host, making them the objects of prayer, and supposing them capable of hearing and favourably answering the supplications of their worshippers; and so true is the application of this principle to both these kinds of idolatry, that the very same Latin word which was attached to the old Roman emperors after canonization, is to this day used before the names of the Roman Catholic saints. *Divus Augustus*, the god Augustus, said the old heathen Roman, speaking of the deified emperor; *Divus Thomas*, the god Thomas, *Divus Bernardus*, the god Bernard, says the modern Christian Roman, speaking of the canonized saints. This language, indeed, we do not find in the English, because the writers of the Roman Church know

that it would be inexpedient, but in the Latin it is familiar. You remember, brethren, the extract from their most learned controversialist, Bellarmine, in which he candidly avows that the canonized saints are *gods by participation*; so that nothing can be more exact than the correspondence between the rank which the old heathen Romans assigned to their inferior deities, and that which the Roman Catholic Church assigns to her saints. And yet, no one will pretend to say that the worship paid to the inferior gods of the heathen was not idolatry, because the worshipper acknowledged that they were only canonized men. The result of the argument seems to my mind clear: that if we worship any other than the one living and true God, we are not the less idolators, because we know the object of our worship to be a creature, and confess it to be inferior in some respects to the supreme and self-existent Deity. It is enough to constitute this deadly sin, if we ascribe *any* of the attributes or render *any* of the homage to creatures, which belongs only to Him; for the commandment is express: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and HIM ONLY shalt thou serve."

Hence, it may be safely inferred, that the Church has no authority to sanction the offering of prayer to the saints, or even to the angels, for the offering of prayer is an act of worship, due to the Creator alone. It is indeed advanced as a specious apology by the Church of Rome, that they only ask the angels and the saints to pray for them; and that, as Christians are directed to ask this of one another, while on earth, much more may they solicit the prayers of the faithful who are in heaven. We have seen, brethren, how far beyond this is the truth of the matter. But granting, for the sake of argument, that it was so, the difference between the cases would still be such, as to destroy the application of the supposed analogy. It is indeed true that we are told to pray for one another, and that the effectual prayer of the righteous man availeth much.

It is true that St. Paul, in many parts of his epistles, asks the brethren to pray for him. Neither do we doubt, that when the righteous departs to the world of spirits, his soul continues to remember and to pray for the Church on earth. But we who remain, cannot, without a positive miracle, converse with the departed saint in language; and although, by possibility, it were revealed to us, that, like Elijah, he was taken into heaven before the general resurrection, even in such a case he could not be present with us to hear our prayers, unless he enjoyed the incommunicable attribute of God himself, which is to be present every where at once. From this very principle we know that the Saviour must be the true God and eternal life, because he promised what none but God could perform when he said: "Wherever two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," and "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world:" and again, "Whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, I will do it." For none but he who is essentially God, can possibly possess the power of hearing, every where at once, the millions upon millions of prayers that are offered to him; so that here is the first branch of the sin involved in the worshipping an invisible and departed saint, that the very act of our addressing him when he is not within the reach of our senses, can only be justified, by supposing him to be invested with one of the attributes of God: and this is idolatry.

But there is a second charge belonging to this deplorable corruption necessary to be considered: which is, that the departed saint must not only be supposed capable of *hearing* all these millions of prayers at once, but also of *complying* with them; and this, to a created being, is equally impossible: for none but God is possessed of the marvellous power of attending, at once, to the desires of innumerable petitioners; and if we suppose any creature to be capable of this, we ascribe to

that creature another of God's incommunicable attributes: and here is the second branch of this idolatry.

These deplorable departures from the plain command of the Most High apply to the whole subject of prayers to angels and saints; but there is a peculiar and almost incredible aggravation of the sin, when we examine the supremacy given to the virgin Mary, and perceive how completely the system of modern Romanism assigns to her the titles and the offices of Christ and the Holy Ghost, and bestows upon her the omnipotence of the blessed Trinity. A melancholy list of instances might here be readily made out, of which I shall only take a few of the more obvious, suggested by the extracts which I have already placed before you.

Christ is the only begotten SON OF GOD, saith the Scripture, and Mary is currently called the *mother of GOD* by the Church of Rome. HE brought life and immortality to light, saith the Scripture; and *Mary brought life and benediction to the human race*, saith the Church of Rome. Christ is our life and our hope, according to the Scripture. *Mary is our life, our sweetness and our hope*, according to the Church of Rome. Christ is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords, saith the Scripture. *Mary is the Queen of heaven, the Queen of angels, the Queen of patriarchs, the Queen of prophets, the Queen of apostles, the Queen of martyrs, the Queen of confessors, the Queen of all saints*, saith the Church of Rome. "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth," saith the glorious Redeemer. *Hail, Mary, lady and mistress of the world, to whom all power has been given both in heaven and in earth*, saith the Church of Rome. "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus," saith the Scripture. *O sacred Virgin Mary, I bless and praise you infinitely, for that you are the great mediatrix between God and man*, saith the Church of Rome. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart

and soul and mind," saith the Scripture. *O my dear mother! I love you more than my tongue can express, and more than my very soul can conceive,* saith the Church of Rome. "We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous," saith the Scripture. *Hail, mother of mercy, most gracious advocate, turn thine eyes of mercy towards us,* saith the Church of Rome. "Come unto me," saith Christ, "all ye that are weak and heavy laden." *Come, hardened sinner,* saith the Church of Rome, *come and behold, Mary stretches out her hand and opens her breast to receive you.* "Greater love than this hath no man," saith our Lord, "that he lay down his life for his friends," and the Scripture speaks of our knowing "the love of Christ that passeth knowledge," and again, "This is love, not that we loved him, but that he loved us, and gave himself for us." *But perhaps,* saith the Church of Rome to the sinner, *you fear the divine majesty in Christ, because, though he was made man, he was still God. Do you desire an advocate with him? Have recourse to Mary. She will be heard for her own sake. Her throne, though exalted, has nothing forbidding, nothing dreadful. Her heart is all love, all tenderness.*

"My Son, give me thy heart," saith the Lord in the Scriptures, "and I will give you a new heart, and put a new spirit within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and will give you a heart of flesh." (Ezek. xxvi. 26.) But the Church of Rome represents the virgin Mary as saying, *Give me your heart, my dear child, and if it be as hard as flint I will make it as soft as wax, and if it be more foul and loathsome than dirt, I will render it more clear and beautiful than chrystal.* Another office of the Spirit is claimed for her: for our Lord calls him the Comforter; but the Church of Rome calls the virgin Mary *the comforter of the afflicted.* "Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men," saith the great Redeemer, (Mat. xii. 31,) "but the blasphemy against

the Spirit shall not be forgiven. And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man it shall be forgiven him, but he that shall speak against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come." In no respect alarmed by this awful denunciation, the Church of Rome presumes to say to the hardened and inveterate sinner, *Come, how great soever your crimes may be; come and behold, Mary opens her breast to receive you. Though insensible to the great concerns of your salvation, though, unfortunately, proof against the most engaging invitations and inspirations of the Holy Ghost, fling yourself at the feet of this powerful advocate.* Here, brethren,—with the feeling of profound grief I say it,—this Church holds up the virgin Mary as having not only more love and tenderness than the Saviour, but more effectual power over the heart than the Holy Ghost. The sinner who doubts the love of Christ, is told to have no doubt of her compassion—the sinner who is so hardened that he is proof against the most engaging invitations and inspirations of the Holy Ghost, is still told to cast himself at her feet. O how wonderful the blindness of the human understanding—how subtle the devices of Satan,—when a Church, retaining all the formal doctrines of Scriptural truth, can yet be led to place her confidence in such deep and awful profanation!

It is painful to dwell any longer upon this sad attempt to provide a parallel to Christ in the virgin mother. But the ingenuity of the Roman Church has carried it into every possible particular. If he was holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners—so, says the Church of Rome, was she, without the slightest taint of sin, original or actual. If his blessed body saw no corruption,—neither, says the Church of Rome, did the body of Mary. His resurrection and ascension are outdone by her resurrection and assumption into heaven. For in the narration given of this latter event, there is a plain determination to make it exceed the simple history of Scripture.

All the apostles fly through the air from distant parts of the earth to be present at her death. There is a vision of angels to honour her. Thomas desires to adore her. The angels sing hymns for three days. Sweet odours impregnate the grave clothes, but the body is gone to heaven, and all the celestial hosts go out to meet her, and she is crowned with the brightest diadem of glory. Alas! what a bold and daring enterprise is here, to invent such a tale, and force mankind, under peril of their curse, to believe it as firmly as the Gospel. And when the poor Roman Catholic obeys the commands of his Church, and flings himself, to use their own language, at the feet of this advocate, who has all power in heaven and in earth, and whom he implores to have mercy upon him by the titles of mother of God, refuge of sinners, queen of heaven, comforter of the afflicted, his life, his sweetness, and his hope,—when he is told in substance that she is more loving and compassionate than Christ, and that when the Holy Ghost can do no more for him, she is able to save,—shall we be deceived by the assertion that the deluded believer does not worship her? that he only asks her to pray for him, as he would ask a pious Christian to do on earth? Shall we be told that there is no profanation in attributing to a creature the omniscience and omnipresence of God, without which she could not hear and answer the prayers of her innumerable worshippers? that there is no idolatry in raising a mere mortal to the throne of omnipotence in heaven? that there is no blasphemy in attributing more efficacy to her than to the Spirit? no perilous impiety in giving her the first and warmest place in the love of the heart, and the confidence of the soul?

The Scriptural argument which belongs to the question, my brethren, is easily stated; since not only is the whole Bible destitute of a single passage, which ingenuity itself can warp into the shape of prayers or worship offered to a departed saint, but we have several pointed reprehensions of all ap-

proach to creature-worship. Thus the homage rendered to our blessed Saviour was given and received as due to his divine nature, as the Son of God. His mother was so far from any share in it, that he seems studiously to avoid even the ordinary appearance of regard; doubtless, as we may reverently believe, because he would not afford the slightest excuse for the subsequent corruption, which he foresaw would come upon his Church from that quarter. And well did the blessed virgin understand the high and holy distance thus placed between them. When at the marriage supper, in Cana of Galilee, she wished the necessities of the party to be supplied, she does not presume to ask him for any direct action, but merely saith to him; *They have no wine.* And his answer is; *Woman, what have I to do with thee?* When, on another occasion, a female lifted up her voice and cried; Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked, he replied; *Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the Word of God and keep it.* At another time, we read that one told him, saying; Thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee. And he answered and said; *Who is my mother, and who are my brethren?* And he stretched out his hand towards his disciples and said; *Behold my mother and my brethren: for whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and my sister, and my mother.* And lastly, when, on the cross, he saw his mother standing together with St. John, he saith to the apostle; *Behold thy mother:* and to the virgin Mary he saith; *Woman, behold thy son!* Here we see a striking departure from the usual language of filial respect and affection, which can only be accounted for satisfactorily by these two peculiarities. First, that our Lord intended the fact of his incarnation to be understood as the mere necessity imposed by the great design of his obedience and atonement for our ruined world, and not by any means as a personal privilege to the virgin, which

should exalt her beyond the rest of his disciples. And, secondly, that he mercifully judged it right to give no encouragement to the idolatry which he foreknew would take its rise from this very source. Hence he nowhere calls her mother. At his death, he transfers her character of mother to St. John, and it is remarkable that throughout the whole of the book of the Acts, the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul, the two of St. Peter, the Epistles of St. James and St. Jude, and the three Epistles of St. John, her name is not once mentioned. As to the Apocalypse, St. John saw the heavens, the throne of God and of the Lamb, and the worship of all the celestial host; but this imaginary queen of heaven, and the throne of St. Joseph, which the Church of Rome declares to be near to the thrones of Jesus and Mary, he saw not. How, indeed, should he have seen what even the Church of Rome did not dream of, until many centuries after the pure days of primitive Christianity had passed away!

But these are not the only proofs which the Scripture affords, as if to leave the Church of Rome without excuse. When St. Peter came in to Cornelius the centurion, "he fell down at his feet and worshipped. But Peter said, *Stand up, for I also am a man.*" And yet the very thing which St. Peter would not allow on earth, is supposed to be acceptable to him in heaven. Lastly, the text furnishes a conclusive testimony against this deplorable abuse, for we read, near the end of the Apocalypse, the following words: "And after I had heard and seen," saith the apostle John, "I fell down to adore before the feet of the angel who showed me these things, and he said unto me: See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them who keep the words of the prophecy of this book: adore God." Here it might perhaps be supposed, that St. John was offering to the angel that worship which belongs to the Almighty; but this is exceedingly improbable, because he was thoroughly instructed

in religious truth; and there is nothing about the passage indicating that he regarded the sublime creature who had been his interpreter in any other light than as an angel. Neither does the word which the translator has rendered *adore*, make any difference; because it is the same word in the original which is elsewhere termed worship, and which is occasionally applied to acts of reverence that had nothing of a religious character. We see, therefore, how carefully the Scripture guards against every approach to creature-worship, even when applied by the purest of the apostles to the highest angels in heaven, where there was the least possible danger of its abuse. How inconceivable then, is it, that the worship, the prayers, the litanies, the rosaries, the novenas, the incense, the love, faith, confidence, and devotion inculcated by the Church of Rome upon her multitudes, without the slightest check, and indeed with every encouragement to idolize the saints and angels, and especially the virgin Mary, could be acceptable to the Almighty King?

But Dr. Wiseman, with every other advocate of his system, although the Scripture be conclusive against him, feels strong in the fathers. And here, brethren, as in the other points of our discussion, we have reason to be thankful for the evidence of truth. Even amongst his chosen witnesses, there is enough to prove, that the corruption we are opposing was unknown to primitive Christianity, and came in by degrees, after the Roman government adopted the Church, and brought upon it the temptations of ease, and affluence, and power. I am conscious, indeed, that you must be wearied by the length of our discussion, and would willingly spare you any further citations of authority; but believing that you would rather bear with me a little longer, than have the subject dismissed without a full examination, I must present a few of those passages, in which it will be seen that the earlier witnesses of Rome testify in our favour.

We shall commence with the celebrated Chrysostom, ordained bishop of Constantinople, A. D. 398, who will give us a very clear opinion on the general principle of intercessors between us and the Lord, which is the basis of all saint and angel worship.

“When we want any thing of men,” saith this eminent father, “we have need of cost and money, and servile adulation, and much going up and down, and great ado. For it falleth out oftentimes, that we cannot go straight to the lords themselves, and present our gifts and speak unto them, but it is necessary for us first to procure the favour of their ministers, and stewards, and officers,—and then, by their mediation, to obtain our request. But with God it is not thus; for there is no need of intercessors for the petitioners, neither is he so ready to give a gracious answer, when entreated by others, as by ourselves praying unto him.”

Again, saith the same eminent teacher; “Mark the philosophy of the woman of Canaan. She entreats not James, she beseeches not John, neither does she come to Peter, but she breaks through the whole company of them, saying: I have no need of a mediator, but taking repentance with me for a spokeswoman, I come to the Fountain itself. For this cause did he descend, for this cause did he take flesh, that I might have boldness to speak unto him. I have no need of a mediator: Have $\tau\eta\upsilon\sigma$, O Lord, mercy upon me.” (Finch, I. 178.)

From Chrysostom, brethren, we pass to Augustin, another of the favourite witnesses of the Church of Rome. “Mary,” saith this father, “was more blessed in adopting the faith of Christ, than in conceiving his flesh. For when some one said to him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, he answered; Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the Word of God and keep it. Thus her maternal relationship would have profited her

nothing, if she had not borne Christ more blessedly in her heart than in her flesh." (Ib. 162.)

Let us next hear the sentiment of Gregory Nyssen, a bishop in the same century, but a little earlier. "The Word of God," saith this father, "hath ordained, that none of those things which have their being by creation shall be worshipped by men, as we may learn out of nearly all the divinely inspired Scriptures. Moses, the tables, the law, the prophets; afterwards, the Gospel, and the decrees of all the apostles, equally forbid our looking to the creature." (Ib. 210.)

A little earlier still, but in the fourth century, Athanasius, the bishop of Alexandria, saith: "Peter, the apostle, admonished Cornelius, who desired to worship him, saying, I also am a man. The angel in the Apocalypse admonished John who desired to worship him, saying; See thou do it not; I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them that keep the sayings of this book. Worship God. Therefore it appertains to God only to be worshipped, and the angels themselves are aware of this; for although they surpass others in glory, they are all creatures, and are not beings to be worshipped, but beings who worship the Lord. The angel, therefore, admonished Manoah, the father of Sampson, who wished to sacrifice to him, saying; Offer not to me, but to God." (Ib. 192.)

Theodoret, bishop of Cyprus in Syria, flourished in the fifth century: and he gives testimony in favour of the same principle. "Because," saith he, "they commanded men to worship angels, he enjoins the contrary, namely, that they should adorn their words and actions with the commemoration of our Lord Christ. Send up thanksgiving, he says, to God the Father through him, (that is Christ) and not through angels. But this evil practice continued in Phrygia and Pisidia for a long time, for which cause the Council of Laodicea forbade them by a law to pray to angels." (Ib. 208.)

Lastly, let us hear Epiphanius, the bishop of Cyprus, who lived in the same century, arguing against the idolatry of the virgin Mary, by a sect of heretics called the Collyridians. "I acknowledge," saith he, "that the body of Mary was holy, but nevertheless she was not a god. And she remained ever a virgin, but she never was proposed to us as an object of worship, since she herself worshipped him who was born of her flesh, but who had descended from heaven and the bosom of the Father. Wherefore, the sacred gospel also admonishes us, in which Christ saith, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee? My hour is not yet come.' Here he calls her woman, lest any one should think her to be of a superior nature, and he used this word as if prophesying for the refutation of those heresies which he knew would arise in the world; that no one should be led away by too great admiration of the holy virgin, to adopt those puerile follies." (Epiph. Tom. I. p. 1061-2.)

"Wherefore, truly, let Mary be honoured, but let the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit be worshipped. *Let no one worship Mary.*" (Ib. 1064.)

There is another part of this ancient writer's work, however, which I consider particularly interesting; because it directly proves that the vain and presumptuous story of the virgin's assumption into heaven, which I have quoted to you from the Roman Breviary, was not in existence in the fifth century. You will remember, brethren, that Epiphanius was a distinguished bishop of that age, the author of two learned volumes against heresies, and honoured besides with a place on the list of canonized saints in the Church of Rome. Thus, therefore, he speaks on the subject of the virgin's death, in an argument against another set of heretics, one of whose errors it was to depreciate her character below the mark of Scripture. "The minds of men," saith Epiphanius, "can never rest, and always incline to evil. But whether the holy virgin died and was buried, so that her death, being in honour and in chastity, the

crown of virginity was granted to her; or whether she was slain, as the Scripture seems to indicate by these words, *The sword shall penetrate her soul also*, and so she obtained the glory and honour of the martyrs, and her sacred body was laden with all felicity, by which light came into the world; or whether, finally, she may not be still alive, for God is able to do whatever he pleases, *but nothing is known certainly about her departure.*" Here, then, we have a positive contradiction to the whole story of the virgin's death, burial, resurrection, and assumption, as related in the Roman Breviary. The truth is, that it was one of the pious fictions prepared to edify the multitude in the dark ages, for not a trace of it can be found until the ninth century. To this I will add the testimony of St. Jerome, who, in his first book against the Pelagians, expressly declares that no mortal was or could be free from sin, except Christ alone: which his commentator, Erasmus, remarks, as being opposed to the universal sentiment concerning the virgin Mary. (Jerome vol. II. p. 2071.) And Leo, the great, declares in many places, that "the soil of human nature, which was exposed to the curse through the first Adam, in the single instance of Christ had produced a blessed germ, free from the vice of its parent stock." (Op. p. 76.) And again, "Christ took our nature, but not its sinfulness, from his mother." (Ib. 72.) Here we have another plain contradiction of the modern Church in the doctrine that the virgin was free from sin.

We have now closed, brethren, a very painful part of our promised series of lectures; and yet one, with many others, of which it is absolutely necessary to have a thorough understanding, if we would know the true character of the Roman system. For in connexion with this doctrine of the virgin and the saints, stands the worship of their images and relics, and a whole train of superstitions, ending in purgatory and indulgences. Of these, images and relics will form our next sub-

ject, and will present to us an abundance of facts, proving the corrupt state of the Church and the urgent necessity which called for the Reformation.

The hour will not permit me to detain you, brethren, by any reflections on the subject of our discourse. But while we bless God that we enjoy the pure worship of his Church,—while we are content to love the memory of his saints, without either speculating about their present state, or attempting to hold with them any direct communication,—while we utterly abjure the notion of any mediator, advocate, or intercessor, besides the blessed Son of the Highest, or any sanctifier, save the Holy Spirit,—let us never forget, that an enlightened opposition to the dangerous corruptions of the Church of Rome, must be united with the kindest feelings of charity towards her people; and let us earnestly implore the Giver of every good and perfect gift, that the pure truth of his own sacred Word may open their eyes to see their errors, and enable them to put their whole trust and confidence in Christ alone.

And for ourselves, beloved brethren, let us be admonished of another kind of idolatry, not less perilous, although it be, indeed, not the doctrine of our Church, but the fruit of our own worldly and unholy temper. Let us look within, and search the secret chambers of our hearts, lest the creature should be suffered to occupy the throne of love and honour which belongs of right to the Creator. The worship and service of our appetites and passions, the idolatry of wealth, and pride, and pleasure, are yet more fatal to the soul than even the servile superstitions which have formed the subject of our lecture. Our hearts must be given to God, our souls must be devoted to the Redeemer, or the sentence of destruction will await us. For it is written: “If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema, maranatha.” May the powerful grace of the Holy Spirit arouse and quicken us: may the infinite compas-

sion of the divine Saviour rest upon us: may the blessing of our Father in heaven guide and direct us, that we may avoid the snares of all idolatry, and be brought at last, in safety, to the mansions of eternal peace and joy.

LECTURE XII.

EXOD. xx. 4.—Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, nor of those things that are in the waters under the earth. Thou shalt not adore them, nor serve them. (Doway version.)

THESE words, my brethren, are a part of the divine law, pronounced on mount Sinai, by the voice of the eternal and invisible God, in the hearing of all the host of Israel. Sad and strange is the history of the disobedience, which the chosen people displayed towards this commandment. But yet more wonderful and melancholy is it to see, how the Christian Church, the spiritual Israel, despising the threatenings and warnings of Scripture, fell into the same corruption; and even consecrated the awful error by a solemn and perpetual decree, so that the absolute reverse of the celestial precept was set forth as an important part of the service of God, and the curse which he proclaimed upon the worshippers of images, was formally denounced against those that worshipped them not.

There is no part of the modern doctrine of the Church of Rome, however, which has been more influenced by the spirit of the Reformation in Protestant countries, than that which regards the worship of relics, images, and the cross. And therefore, in order to place you in full possession of her system, I shall first state the form which it assumes in the hands

of Dr. Wiseman; secondly, give you the authoritative decrees of the Councils of Nice and Trent; thirdly, answer the arguments on which our ingenious author relies; and lastly, present some facts, which will exhibit the practical operation of the doctrine in our own day, in those parts of the world where the sovereignty of the Church of Rome exists in full perfection.

According to this arrangement of our subject, we are to commence with the statement of Dr. Wiseman, which is in the following words :

“The Roman Catholic believes,” saith he, “that any thing which has belonged to men, distinguished by their love of God, and by what they have done and suffered in his cause, deserves that respect and honour which is constantly shown, in ordinary life, to that which has belonged to any great, or celebrated, or very good man.”—“They believe that they please God by showing respect to those objects, and that by honouring these relics of the saints, they are incited to imitate their example.” (Vol. II. p. 96-7.) “They further believe, that it has pleased God to make use of such objects, as instruments for performing great works and imparting great benefits to his people; that they are to be treated with respect, and with an humble hope, that as God has been pleased often to employ them, so he may again; and thus they are considered as possessing symbolic virtue. Now we do find,” continues our author, “that God has made use of such instruments before. In the Old Law, he raised up a dead man by his coming in contact with the bones of one of his prophets. The moment he touched the holy prophet’s bones, he arose, restored to life.” “We read that upon handkerchiefs which had touched the body of St. Paul being taken to the sick, they were instantly restored to health; and these were relics in the Catholic sense of the word. We read that a woman was cured, who only touched the hem of our Saviour’s garment; that the skirts of his raiment were impregnated with that power which issued

from him, so as to restore health without his exercising any act of his will. Here is the foundation of our practice," saith Dr. Wiseman, "which excludes all idea of superstition. Those examples prove that God makes use of the relics of his saints as instruments for his greatest wonders,—and consequently there can be no superstition in the belief that he may do so again." (Ib. 99.)

On the other point of the worship rendered to images and pictures of the saints, our learned advocate contents himself with saying, that "the Council of Trent defines two things as the belief of the Roman Catholic Church; first, that it is wholesome or expedient to have pictures, or images, and representations of the saints; in the second place, that honour and respect are to be paid to them. This," saith he, "is therefore the whole of our doctrine." (Ib. 105.) "We agree that no image should be made for adoration or worship. But the simple making of them is not sinful, for it was prescribed by God. In the tabernacle, there were cherubim in the holy of holies, and the two walls of the temple were sculptured with graven images."—"The whole question, then, turns upon this: whether Roman Catholics are justified in making use of them as sacred memorials, and in praying before them, as inspiring faith and devotion. I may be asked," continues he, "what warrant there is in Scripture for all this? I might answer, that I ask none; for rather I might ask, what authority is there to deprive me of these objects? because it is the natural right of man to use any thing towards promoting the worship of God, which is not in any way forbidden." (Ib. 106.) "If I find that a picture, or representation of our Saviour, or of his blessed mother, or of his saints, acts more intimately on my affections, and excites warmer feelings of devotion, I am justified and act well, in endeavouring so to excite them."

There are errors enough, brethren, in this argument of Dr. Wiseman, which I shall notice by and by; but I must pre-

viously rectify the greatest error of all, namely, the *holding back* the full extent of his Church's doctrine, while he expressly declares that he *sets forth the whole*. Let me therefore, in the next place, show the real state of the case, by going to what the Church of Rome admits to be the fountain head, the solemn and authoritative decrees of the General Councils—the second Council of Nice being the great authority for image worship, and the Council of Trent having pronounced its decision upon the entire subject, images, relics and all; and that too, since the Reformation. When we have learned from these the doctrine of the Roman Church, we shall be prepared to test the candour of our learned advocate, and to discuss the argument as he presents it, on the ground of Scripture and the testimony of the fathers.

Of these two Councils, I shall first cite the Council of Trent, in the 25th session of which, (Hard. Conc. Tom. X. p. 168) after enjoining upon all bishops and priests the diligent instruction of the people in the duty of venerating and invoking the saints, and denouncing, as impious, those who deny that such supplications, "whether by the voice or by the mind," should be rendered to them, the Council proceeds to the point which more immediately concerns our present subject, in these words:

"The holy bodies also of the martyrs and others, living with Christ, are to be venerated by the faithful; for they were, when living, the members of Christ, and the temples of the Holy Ghost, and shall be raised again and glorified, and through them many favours are bestowed on man by the Almighty: so that those who affirm that veneration and honour are not due to the relics of the saints, or that it is useless for the faithful to honour these and other sacred memorials, and that it is vain to visit the sepulchres of the saints in order to ask their help, are to be *altogether condemned*, as the Church *has already condemned, and does also now condemn them.*"

"Moreover," continues the Council, "the images of Christ,

of the virgin, the mother of God, and of the other saints, are to be had and retained, especially in Churches, and due honour and veneration are to be rendered to them; not because it may be supposed that there is in them any divinity, or virtue, on account of which they are to be worshipped; or that any thing is to be asked of them, or that confidence is to be placed in images, as was formerly the case amongst the heathen, who rested their hope on idols; but because *the honour which is exhibited to them, is referred to the prototype, which they represent*; so that through the images which we kiss, and before whom we uncover our heads and bow down, we adore Christ, and venerate the saints whose similitude these images do bear. *The same doctrine is sanctioned by the decrees of the Councils, especially the second Council of Nice, against the opposers of images."*

"Let the bishops diligently teach, that the people are to be instructed and confirmed in the assiduous commemorating and cherishing of the articles of the faith, through the mysteries of our redemption, expressed historically in pictures or other similitudes; for great benefit is received from all sacred images, not only because the people are thereby admonished of the blessings and gifts which they have received from Christ, but also, because, through the saints of God, miracles and wholesome examples are placed before the eyes of the people, in order that they may return thanks to God for them, may conduct their own lives in imitation of the lives of the saints, and may be excited to the adoration and worship of God, and the cultivation of piety. But if any one shall teach or think contrary to these decrees, *let him be anathema.*"

In this decree of the Council of Trent, brethren, you perceive that distinct reference is made to the second Council of Nice, and therefore I shall proceed to set before you the definitive action of that celebrated Council, only premising, that it sat in A. D. 787, after the introduction of images had been for

a long time the exciting cause of the most distressing tumults and confusion; and especially after a previous Council, called by the Greek emperor, had decided against images, in the strongest and plainest terms. In this quarrel about images, the Church of Rome took one side, and the Church of Greece took the other; and the second Council of Nice was called and sustained through Roman influence.

The definitive decree of this Council is as follows: "Taught by the ancient fathers, we salute the venerable images.—Whoever does not consent herein, let him be anathema.—We salute the words of the Lord, of the prophets and apostles, by which we have learned to honour and magnify, in the first place, her who is truly and properly the mother of God, and superior to all celestial powers; and then the holy and angelic powers, and the blessed and glorious apostles, the prophets and noble martyrs who fought for Christ, and the holy and god-bearing masters, and all holy men; whose intercessions we seek, as able to render us acceptable to God the King of all, keeping his commandments, and diligent to live in virtue. And we salute also the figure of the precious and vivifying cross, and the holy relics of the saints. Moreover, we honour and salute these precious and venerable images, and honourably adore them, namely, the image of the humanity of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ, and of our most holy and pure lady the mother of God,—and of the holy incorporeal angels, who appeared in human form to the just. In like manner also, the figures and effigies of the divine and most famous apostles and prophets, and of the martyrs and holy men, since they are able by their pictures to lead us to remember them, and *draw us to the originals*, and make us *partakers of a certain sanctification*." (Hard. Con. Tom. 4. p. 262, & p. 266.)

"To these," therefore, "*kisses and honourable adoration* shall be rendered, but not that superior worship, (*latria*) which is according to faith, and alone becomes the divine nature.

And to these, namely, the precious figure of the vivifying cross, and to the holy gospels, and the other holy memorials, let the offering of *incense* and *lighted candles* be exhibited in their honour, according to ancient custom. For the honour of the image passes to its original, and *whoever adores the image, adores in it the substance of the representation.*" (Ib. 455.)

"If any one does not admit the evangelical narrations made by titles or pictures, *let him be anathema.*"

"If any one does not kiss them, as made in the name of the Lord and his saints, *let him be anathema.*" (Ib. 471.)

This Council, however, brethren, was not content with these decrees in favour of images, relics, and the sign of the cross. They even went so far as to order, that no Church should be erected without some relics of the saints being deposited therein, as if the Lord could have no earthly sanctuary, separate from the bodies of the martyrs.

"Forasmuch as many of the venerable temples," saith the Council, "have been consecrated without the relics of the martyrs, we decree that relics shall be placed in them according to the accustomed rule. And if, from the present time, any bishop be found to consecrate a temple without relics, *let him be deposed, as one who transgresses the ecclesiastical tradition.*" (Ib. 491.)

From these extracts, you may readily perceive how very much diluted and moderated is the representation of Dr. Wiseman. He says nothing of the word adore—nothing of the kiss, the uncovering of the head, and the prostration of the worshipper before the holy images—nothing of the burning of incense and lighting of candles in their honour—nothing of the decree that no Church should be consecrated unless the relics of the martyrs were placed in it; and especially nothing of the repeated *anathemas* pronounced against all who should presume to dissent from the doctrine. Here, therefore, we have another proof of the influence of the Reformation upon the

Church of Rome, in all those countries where it has established its Scriptural principles. Notwithstanding their confident boast of infallibility and unchangeableness, we find a manifest shrinking, in several respects, from their own standards of doctrine; and an evident effort to keep their more objectionable features in the shade. And we thank God for it, and earnestly pray that the process of amelioration may go on, until they shall openly free themselves from all that they cannot justify, and exchange the idle claim of infallibility for the substantial benefits of truth.

But I am now, in the third place, to examine the arguments adduced by our learned author in favour of the Roman doctrine; and this, as in all other cases, involves first, the testimony of Scripture, and secondly, the testimony of the fathers.

On the subject of relics, Dr. Wiseman adduces one remarkable example from the Old Testament, and several from the New. The resurrection of the dead man, whose body was unintentionally brought in contact with the bones of the prophet Elisha, the healing of the woman who touched the hem of our Saviour's garment, the curing of the sick by the handkerchiefs and aprons brought to them from the person of St. Paul—all prove, according to the Roman doctrine, that it has pleased God to use the relics, and other things belonging to the Saviour and the saints, as instruments whereby he worked wonders; and therefore the Church of Rome believes, that what he has done once by such instrumentality he may do again; and this, our learned author seems to think, is a sufficient justification.

But nothing can be more fallacious than this reasoning, brethren, although it looks specious, and has, in fact, deluded many a weak mind. The question is not whether the Almighty has chosen to employ those various kinds of instrumentality in the working of wonders, and whether, as he has sometimes done so, it may not please him to do it again. On

such a proposition there can be no dispute, for every believer in the Bible must at once accede to it. But the question is, whether these *occasional* and *extraordinary* manifestations were erected into a *systematic doctrine for the Church*, and handed down as a part of her creed with the same solemn and abiding authority, as the acknowledgment of the Trinity, the incarnation, and the atonement, and the sacraments, and the ministry, and in a word, the principles of regular and constant belief and practice; so that Christians are *bound always to expect miracles from the bones and handkerchiefs of the saints*, and are authorized to *fulminate anathemas* against those who think such wonders were only intended to be *rare and occasional*.

The distinction, brethren, is all-important, and therefore I am anxious to make myself perfectly understood. Permit me, therefore, to enlarge upon the idea, by a brief sketch of the divine dispensations, with relation to the point before us.

In the infinite wisdom and goodness of God, the glorious gospel of his salvation, through our Lord Jesus Christ, was provided for our fallen world; and the knowledge of his truth was given at various periods of the history of man, marking what may be called epochs, or dispensations; to each of which a system was attached, forming successive developments of the same great plan, and suited to the various stages of the mighty work, which the Almighty, by his own right hand and holy arm, stood pledged to perform.

Of these dispensations, the patriarchal was the first, lasting from the fall of Adam until the deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt. The Mosaic dispensation was the second, lasting from the giving of the law and the erection of the tabernacle in the wilderness, until the organization of the Church of Christ on the day of Pentecost. The Christian, or Gospel dispensation, so called by way of eminence, was the third and the last, which is to continue until the second coming of our

Lord, and is now supposed, by many, to be near its termination. In each of these dispensations, there was the same fundamental truth, and the same gracious purpose. The difference lay in the various degrees of their development. And perhaps nothing can so beautifully express their unity and their distinctness, as the language of our blessed Saviour, where he compares them to the blade, the ear, and the full corn in the ear, carrying on the analogy to the time of his second advent, by saying: "afterwards he putteth in the sickle, for the harvest is come."

Now, each of these dispensations had its *wonders*, and its **SYSTEM**. The wonders were granted in order to demonstrate that the system was of divine obligation, worthy of all faith and confidence; but the system was the regular instruction in truth, both theoretical and practical, by which mankind were to be brought out of darkness into light—out of the bondage of Satan, into a blessed subjection to their heavenly King. The system of the patriarchal stage was very simple. The revelation was handed down by oral communication from father to son: the eldest of the family was charged with the office of priest and judge: the only preparation for religious rites was an altar, and the only ordinances were sacrifice and prayer, to which, in the time of Abraham, was added circumcision. But the wonderful works of God in that first stage of the world's history, were doubtless abundant; although the brief outline of Scripture mentions but a few. The judgment of Cain, the translation of Enoch, the building of the ark, and the miraculous obedience of the wild beasts enclosed in it, the dreadful deluge, the destruction of Babel, the confusion of tongues, the conflagration of Sodom and Gomorrhah, with other miraculous events, formed no part of the **SYSTEM** which we call patriarchal, but were occasional exhibitions of the tremendous power of God, granted in order to awaken

men from their awful lethargy, and lead them to seek the truth, which could alone make them wise unto salvation.

The same distinction is plainly shown, in the second, or the Mosaic dispensation. The wonders that attended its first establishment were stupendous, for not only Egypt and the surrounding nations, but Israel also was sunk in idolatry, and needed the manifestation of all these wonders, to convince them, that the God of Israel was the only living and true God, whose was the kingdom, the power, and the glory. The system as now instituted, had the immense superiority of a written record of the divine Word, instead of the former uncertain oral tradition; together with a special tribe and family for the priesthood, and a magnificent tabernacle for the worship of God, and a multitude of ceremonial rites, full of a spiritual meaning, and calculated to prepare the Jewish people, and through them, the world, for the still distant day of the promised Messiah. After the system was perfectly established, the wonders ceased; although we find them partially and rarely recurring, the most remarkable period of miracles being allotted to the ten tribes, during the ministry of Elijah and Elisha. These ten tribes, you remember, had separated from Judah and Benjamin. They thus deprived themselves of the advantages which belonged to the regular system, and fell into awful idolatry; and we may reverently imagine that this may have been in part the reason, why they had so much more of the *extraordinary* manifestations of divine power, because, being destitute of the authorized priesthood and tabernacle, their deplorable condition needed them so greatly.

Precisely on the same principle, the Christian dispensation was established in the midst of wonders, commanding, as before, the assent and obedience of mankind to the system of the Church. And now the ordinances of circumcision and sacrifice were changed into baptism and the holy eucharist, the

restriction of the priesthood was removed, and the office was put under a spiritual law suited to all families and all nations; to the written revelations of the Old Testament, were added the inspired histories, epistles and prophecies of the New; Jew and Gentile found the partition wall broken down from between them; and from the elementary rudiments of the Mosaic dispensation, was produced the finished and complete system of the Gospel.

And here, by the way, brethren, from the Saviour's comparison of the various developments of his Church, to the growth of the wheat, we may learn the character and value of religious forms and ordinances. It is true, indeed, that after our world has accomplished its present course, these forms and ordinances will give place to a still more spiritual system. It is equally true, that even here, if taken by themselves, they are of no more importance than the chaff which is separated from the grain in the threshing-floor. But while the Church is still on earth, still growing and ripening for the heavenly harvest, she can no more attain her proper maturity without forms and ordinances, than the grain in the ear can grow without its husks. They may be counted as chaff by and by, but in our present state they are an indispensable part of the divine system.

But this is a digression, for which I should crave your pardon. Let us recur to the main argument, in which I designed to explain clearly the difference, between the *SYSTEMS* which the Lord had mercifully granted to mankind, and the *wonders* which were performed in the establishment of those systems. For nothing is more necessary to a clear idea of the Roman Catholic error, in this and many other points, than a just apprehension of the fundamental distinction, which I have been endeavouring to explain. And you will readily see its importance, when we come to apply it to the cases recorded in the sacred history.

You remember, for instance, the marvellous occurrence which took place during the passage of the Israelites through the wilderness, when a brazen serpent was made by the divine command, and put upon a pole, and every one that looked on it was healed of the bite of the fiery flying serpents. Now we find that this very image was carefully preserved until the days of the good king Hezekiah, who broke it to pieces, because the children of Israel burnt incense to it. And he called its name Nehushtan, (4 Kings xviii. 4) which signifies, a piece of brass. Why did the pious monarch condemn the conduct of the people, and destroy the image? Because its history belonged, not to the *system* of religious truth, but only to the wonderful events by which that system was established. Hezekiah drew the distinction well and wisely. The works of God were to be revered as HE would have them revered, and not in some other way of man's devising. And the system of God's truth is to be preserved as he has delivered it, and not to be either enlarged or diminished, to humour human indifference, or human superstition. And therefore when the people took the brazen serpent, which belonged to the miraculous establishment of the Mosaic dispensation, into the *forms of worship which belonged to the system itself*, they sinned grievously, and the king did most rightly in taking the temptation away.

The same principle, brethren, will apply to the case which Dr. Wiseman has brought forward, as a justification for the relic-worship of the Church of Rome. "Eliseus," (or, as we usually call him, Elisha,) "died, and they buried him, and the rovers from Moab came into the land the same year. And some that were burying a man, saw the rovers, and cast the body into the sepulchre of Eliseus, and when it had touched the bones of Eliseus, the man came to life, and stood on his feet." (4 Kings xiii. 20, 21.) The uses of this miracle we are not told. How far it instructed Israel and even Moab,

and tended to bring them to the knowledge and worship of the true God—how far it stopped the predatory warfare carried on at that very time, or in how many various ways it might have been eminently beneficial—it is impossible for any one to say. But it is certain that the fact belonged to the *wonders* of their history, and not to the *system of their religion*, just as in the case of the brazen serpent. And hence they suffered the body of the prophet to continue as before, without worshipping his relics, or appearing to look upon it in any other light than as a solitary miracle, such as had never taken place previously, and might never take place again. Had the Israelites in those days regarded it in the same light as the modern Church of Rome, they would have inscribed the prophet's name in the calendar to be worshipped, set a day apart in his honour, enshrined his relics in gold and silver, given them a place in their temple, pronounced an anathema against every one who refused to do them reverence, and looked to them as one of the regular parts of the divine institution, for the healing of diseases, raising the dead, and every other miraculous instrumentality. But nothing of the kind was done. There were no relics known to the Jewish system. And therefore, in our Saviour's time, the Pharisees showed their ostentatious piety, by adorning the sepulchres and tombs of the prophets; but *rifling them of their contents, and converting the mouldering bones into objects of worship*, was reserved for the wayward superstition of a far later day.

I come next, however, to the examples which our ingenious author presents to us from the New Testament; where the woman was healed of a hæmorrhage by touching the hem of the Saviour's garment; and handkerchiefs, taken from the body of St. Paul, cured the sick. And here, brethren, I marvel greatly to find Dr. Wiseman asserting, that in the first of these cases there was "*no exercise of the Saviour's will.*" Where did he make that discovery? Even his own theory does

not regard the relics of the saints as instrumental in doing wonders by any *inherent efficacy*, but only on the ground that it pleased God to use them for such purpose. Surely, therefore, it is highly presumptuous in any one to say, that when the woman touched the Saviour's garment, her cure was without any exercise of his will. He who knew all things, even the secret thoughts of every heart, must have known the whole circumstances and have willed the result, else his own doctrine would be strangely falsified, that "even the sparrow doth not fall to the ground without our heavenly Father."

But in all these cases, the distinction applies. These miracles belonged to the *wonders* which attended the history of the Gospel dispensation in its establishment; and were no more intended to belong to its REGULAR SYSTEM than the brazen serpent, or the case of Elisha's bones, or any of the mighty works of God in ancient Israel, were intended to belong to the regular system of the Mosaic dispensation. The touching of our Saviour's garments, therefore, did wonders, *when HE pleased to have the wonders done*, and at no other season. We do not read of their being adopted as a part of the regular ordinances of God, neither do we find those garments working miracles after the soldiers had stripped them from his sacred body. And so, likewise, in the case of the handkerchiefs which were taken from the person of St. Paul, it is probable that his prayers accompanied their application; and that apart from this, they would have had no efficacy whatever. But had it been a part of the divine SYSTEM, that such things should be held in honour by the Church for ever, and be laid up and revered as the *regular instruments* by which health, and deliverance, and blessings innumerable should be dispensed to the end of the world, we should surely have had the apostles making presents to the Churches of their *garments* as well as their *epistles*; and instead of St. Stephen, the first martyr, being carried by devout men to his burial, we should read

of his being embalmed for the purpose of preserving his relics, and every article belonging to his person, down to the shoe latchet, would have been distributed by the order of St. Peter with as much care as the popes, who call themselves his successors, employ, when they send presents of much meaner relics than those of St. Stephen, in our own day. If then it be admitted, as it must needs be, that the duty of the Church is to be regulated by the precepts and example of Christ and his apostles, and neither precept nor example can be found for the veneration of relics, it manifestly results, that the Church of Rome has incurred an awful hazard by her decrees in behalf of such a doctrine, and especially by pronouncing her anathemas on all who differ from her. I shall only observe, in concluding this branch of our subject, that Dr. Wiseman has taken a most unwarrantable liberty with the meaning of words, where he says, that at the time the miracles were wrought by the garments of Christ and the handkerchiefs of St. Paul, they were "*RELICS in the Catholic sense of the term.*" They were not relics at all, during the life of their respective wearers, and yet it was only during their life, and doubtless, by their desire, that the miracles were effected. But in order to entitle them to the appellation of relics, they must be taken after the death of the former wearers, for the word relic comes from *relicta*, signifying what is *left behind*, and therefore it is never applied by the Church of Rome to the garments of any saint, while he is yet in being. Hence it results, that there is no example in Scripture of the case which Dr. Wiseman's doctrine requires, namely, of a miracle being effected by the garments or other things which had belonged to a deceased saint, *after the decease of the owner*. The single instance which can properly be called a miracle by relics, is that of Elisha; and the argument already delivered on that instance is sufficient, I trust, to show, that it is directly hostile to the doctrine for which it is cited.

On the other point of controversy, namely, the worship of images, our author seems to give up the Scriptural argument altogether. He tells us, indeed, that the mere *making* of them cannot be unlawful, because the Lord commanded them to be placed on the ark, and in the tabernacle; and he grants that they ought *not* to be made for adoration or worship. "And the question," saith he, "is therefore whether the Roman Catholic is justified in praying before them, and using them as memorials, inspiring faith and devotion." "I may be asked," continues our author, "what warrant there is in Scripture for all this. I might answer that I ask none, for rather I might ask what authority there is to deprive me of these objects? because it is the *natural right* of man to use any thing towards promoting the worship of God, which is not in any way forbidden."

Now here, brethren, is the direct avowal of a most corrupt principle, sufficient of itself to sanction a thousand follies and superstitions, and, as it appears to me, utterly unsustained by any argument, either of faith or reason. I refer to Dr. Wiseman's assertion that it is the *natural right* of man to use any thing he pleases in the worship of God, provided it be not forbidden. For what *natural rights* have we, where the worship of God is concerned? We are utterly condemned, as sinners, by nature and by practice, and all our rights in religion are conferred *not by nature, but by grace*, and must therefore be regulated by HIS Word, and not by our imagination. A similar error, although exhibited in a different way, was that of the Pharisees, who added an immense number of traditionary observances to the divine law, intending thereby to increase their devotion. But listen to the judgment of Christ concerning them: "In vain do they worship me," said the Saviour, "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

In the next place, however, it seems to my mind that our author's own concession utterly disproves his Church's doc-

trine. For while he contends that the mere making of images cannot be sinful; since the Lord himself commanded the figures of cherubim to be placed in his temple; he nevertheless grants, expressly, that images *ought not* to be made *for adoration or worship*. But what then, I would ask Dr. Wiseman, are those acts which the councils order in honour of images? The uncovering the head, the falling prostrate, the kisses of devout affection, the burning of incense, and the lighting of candles before the holy images, as the second Council of Nice constantly calls them—what are all these, if they be not acts of worship? In the case of the brazen serpent, we only read of the people burning incense to it, and the Roman Catholic commentators admit that this was an act of idolatry which justified king Hezekiah in destroying it. But here we have the kisses, the incense, the lighting of candles, and prostration, all together. And besides this, what are we to understand by the express words of that very council, decreeing that “the honour of the image passes to its original, and whoever adores the image, adores in it, the substance of the representation?” It is not possible, brethren, to reconcile all this with the principle admitted by Dr. Wiseman. The true meaning of it, however, is well expressed by a far greater authority in the Roman Church than any living man, namely, the famous Thomas Aquinas, whom they call the angelical Doctor, and who stands on their Calendar as a canonized saint. For he says expressly, that “as Christ himself is adored with the highest worship, (*latria*) so his image is to be adored with the same.” (Th. Aquin. Sum. Theol. Par. 3. Quæstio 25. Art. 3. p. 53.) He gives the very same decision as to the worship of the cross, that “because Christ was suspended on it, and he stained it with his precious blood, therefore not only the original cross, but every image of it, no matter of what material, should be adored with the same kind of worship, which is due to Christ himself.” (Ib. Art. 4.) It seems a mere trifling with language, therefore,

to deny that worship is expressly ordered by the Church of Rome, to images;—the highest worship, which they call *latria*, to the images of Christ and the cross; and to the images of the saints, the worship which they call *dulia*; namely, the same sort of worship which they render to the saints themselves. What that is, we saw sufficiently, brethren, in our last lecture.

Having thus disposed of the other authorities of our learned advocate, I have next to set before you the testimony of the fathers, which will satisfy you that an ample number of witnesses may be appealed to, in proof that these doctrines could never have been approved by the primitive Church.

Thus, for example, Lactantius writes, A. D. 320: “There is *no religion wherever there is an image*. For if religion consists in divine things, and there is nothing divine but in heavenly things; images, therefore, are without religion, for there can be nothing heavenly in that which is earthly.” (Finch, 232.)

About a century earlier, the celebrated Origen saith: “Who in his senses would not smile to see a man, after his brilliant and philosophical disputations upon God, or upon the gods, turn his eyes to statues, and either offer prayers to them, or *endeavour by contemplating them, as some conspicuous sign, to raise his mind to the conception of the intelligent Deity.*” (Ib. 188.)

And again: “Christians and Jews,” saith Origen, “refrain from these on account of that precept of the law, ‘Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.’ Also upon account of that commandment, ‘Thou shalt have none other gods but me; thou shalt not make to thyself an image, or the likeness of those things that are in heaven or on earth;’ which so prohibits to us altars and images, *that we ought to die rather than contaminate our faith to God with such impieties.*” (Ib.)

And again: "The images that are to be dedicated to God, *are not the works of artists*, but what are wrought and formed within us by the Word of God, namely, *virtues in imitation of HIM who was the first-born of every creature.*" (Ib.)

The next testimony, brethren, is taken from the Council of Eliberis in Spain, held about the year 300, which resolved as follows:

"It seemed good to us that *pictures ought not to be in the Churches, lest that which is worshipped or adored, be painted upon the walls.*" (Ib. 256.)

Again, the eminent Epiphanius, A. D. 366, writes thus, in a letter which Jerome translated, and doubtless, therefore, fully approved. Speaking of his visit to a certain Church: "I found there," saith he, "a veil hanging at the door of the Church, dyed and painted, and having the image as it were of Christ or of some saint; for I do not rightly recollect whose image it was. When, therefore, I saw, that *contrary to the authority of the Scriptures, the image of a man was hung up in the Church of Christ*, I cut it, and counselled the guardians of the place that they should rather use it as a winding sheet for some poor man's burial." (Ib. 244.)

In like maner, St. Augustin saith: "This is the chief cause of *this mad impiety*, that a figure resembling a living form operates more forcibly upon the feelings of these wretched men, than its being manifest that it is not living, and *therefore that it ought to be despised by the living.*" (Ib. 158.)

Lastly, St. Ambrose, the preceptor of Augustin, saith, "Rachel hid the sacred images, signifying the Church, or prudence, because *the Church knows nothing of these empty ideas and vain figures of images*, but acknowledges the true substance of the Trinity." (Tom. I. p. 429. § 27.)

We see here, brethren, sufficient proof, that the worship of images was a complete innovation upon the early and purer doctrine of the primitive Church, although, after many violent

struggles, it finally gained the ascendancy, and was established about 700 years after the sacrifice of the Redeemer, in the second Council of Nice, whose decrees have been cited.

The other corruption, respecting the worship of relics and the cross, appears to have had its first rise in the veneration with which the martyrs were regarded. It became a custom for Christians to hold a yearly service at their tombs or sepulchres, on the day of their martyrdom, which was called their birth-day, (*natalitia*) because it was believed that they then entered into heavenly glory. When the Gospel of Christ became the established religion of the Roman empire, Churches were built over these tombs or sepulchres wherever it was convenient; and where it was not, the remains of the martyrs were transferred to the altar of the new edifice, and their day was kept with more pomp and solemnity than ever; discourses being pronounced annually in their praise, which led to a very pernicious display of laudatory exaggeration. From praying *for* them, the Church next began to pray *to* them; and as the influence of superstition, once excited and approved, never fails to increase with vast rapidity, the reports of miracles performed by their means, and the rivalry between the altars of different Churches, produced a constant effort to exalt the value of relics and the merits of the saints, until it reached the highest extravagance. The extent to which it is carried in Roman Catholic countries, even at this day, must be witnessed before it can be believed; but a few extracts from the Breviary and other books of authority, may give you some idea of it.

Thus, in the lesson appointed to be read on the Festival of St. Isidore, we find the following passage: "His body, which was at first laid, according to his own injunctions, between his brother Leander and his sister Florentine, was afterwards translated to Leon by Ferdinand I., king of Castile and Leon, who purchased it at a great price from Henctus, the Saracen, then reigning in Seville. A temple was forthwith built in his

honour, and there, distinguished by his miracles, he is venerated by the people with great devotion." (Finch, Supplement, p. 196.)

Of St. Ubald, the same infallible authority relates, that "his body, which remains uncorrupted after so many ages, is honoured with the great veneration of the faithful in his country, *which he has more than once delivered from imminent danger.*" (Ib. 196.)

Of St. Januarius, the Breviary declares as follows: "The Neapolitans, admonished by the Lord, carried away the body of St. Januarius, which being first conveyed to Benevento, thence to the monastery of the Virgin's Mount, and lastly transferred to Naples, and placed in the principal Church, was renowned for many miracles. But the miracle which is chiefly to be commemorated is, that it formerly *extinguished volumes of flames breaking forth from Mount Vesuvius*, and diffusing the fear of devastation not only in the neighbourhood but even in distant regions. This also is remarkable, that his blood, which is preserved coagulated in a glass vial, when it is placed in sight of the head of the same martyr, is even at the present day seen to liquefy and boil in a wonderful manner, as if it were only recently shed." (Ib. 200.)

Of St. Francis Xavier, the same Breviary saith, that "his body, twice covered over with quick-lime for several months, but quite uncorrupted, exuded sweet odour and blood; and when it was carried to the Malaccas, *it immediately extinguished a fierce pestilence.*" (Ib. 202.)

Of St. Peter Chrysologus, we read, that "his sacred body is even to this day religiously venerated, but one of his arms, being ornamented with gold and gems, and carried to Ravenna, is venerated in the Ursian Church." (Ib.)

And of St. Andrew Corsini it is said, in the same book, that "his body reposes at Florence in the Church of his order, and is revered with the greatest veneration of the citizens, to

whom, more than once, *it has been a protection in imminent danger.*" (Ib. 204.)

These few specimens, brethren, are taken from the standard devotional book of the Church of Rome, called the Breviary; and show distinctly the religious veneration rendered, and the extraordinary miracles attributed to the relics of the saints. The wonderful appearances related of images, pictures, crosses, &c., would quite exceed my limits and your patience. But it is necessary to add, that the intelligence of the age has made no difference in these superstitions, wherever the authority of Rome is supreme. Thus, for example, since the year 1790, publications have been made of the miraculous image of the virgin at Ancona, opening and shutting its eyes on public occasions. In consideration of which miracle, the pope instituted a pious fraternity in honour of the image, under the name of the sons and daughters of Mary. The opening, and shutting, and turning of the eyes of the image, still continuing, at intervals, for some years, Pius VII., in person, crowned the miraculous image on the 13th of May, 1814, fixed the annual feast in its honour for the second Sunday of the same month, and attached to it the power of a plenary indulgence. (Philpot's Let. to Butler, Supp. 402, 3.)

At Torricella, about the same time, we are gravely assured that a torrent of tears was shed by a wooden image of the virgin. And at Ancona, a picture representing St. Anne teaching the virgin Mary to read, was seen to be animated, so that the two faces turned their eyes towards the spectators. (Ib. p. 411.) But at Mercatello, a still more wonderful occurrence was said to have taken place. "A very ancient picture of the virgin and child was there, on an altar in the Collegiate Church; when it was observed that the countenance assumed a brilliant tint, the eyes became lively, and the features, which had become almost effaced, again became distinctly visible. The countenance of the infant Jesus, which

the mother held in her arms, changed colour; and several times was the divine infant seen to bend towards the glass which covered the picture, to signify, as it were, how acceptable was the devotion of the pious multitude that was present at the spectacle." (Ib. p. 411.)

In Roman Catholic countries, there seems to be no end to these marvellous tales, nor has the long-cherished confidence of the people, in images and relics, become at all lessened. But it is said that there are many minds of superior culture amongst them, who look down upon all this as a collection of absurdities, which they tolerate only because they see no way of breaking it down, without destroying all respect for religion along with it. How far this assertion is true, we have no means of ascertaining; but it is manifest, that in those countries where the Reformation has taken root, the champions of the Church of Rome, like Dr. Wiseman, pass over the whole of the subject in terms as general and slight as possible, and plainly show, that if it were practicable, they would gladly consign it to oblivion.

Let me now, brethren, in conclusion, ask how far we have discharged our own Christian duty in this matter—how far have we laboured to promote the salutary influence of Scriptural truth, amongst the multitudes who are in bondage to this yoke of superstition? Have we thought of them with kindness and good will—prayed for them with zeal and earnestness—and been careful to recommend our own purer system of Gospel truth, by a life of higher morality and more fervent devotion?

It is an age of effort for the cause of missions, and immense works are undertaken, and prosecuted with ardour, for the conversion of the distant heathen. Nor is it often, I trust, that the ministers of Christ, amongst the various Protestant Churches, offer up their public supplications to the throne of grace, without remembering the condition of those benighted

nations who are still sitting in the region and shadow of death. And this is all right, assuredly; for it well becomes the follower of Christ, who knows that He died for the sins of the whole world, to be constantly mindful of his blessed purpose, that the Gospel should be preached to every creature.

But brethren, I beseech you to say, whether the unity and well-being of the Church of God is not still more imperatively the object of our labours and our prayers. And believing that wherever the fundamental doctrines of the Christian creed are held, there must be a portion of that Church—believing therefore, that the Church of Greece, although greatly corrupted, is a branch of the Church Universal—that the Churches of Abyssinia, and Armenia, and Syria, are likewise branches of the same—that the Church of Rome, although the most corrupted of them all, is a most extensive and important part of the same Church Catholic or Universal; and that we are consequently bound to acknowledge them as members of the great family of Christ—are we at liberty to feel indifferent to their errors, to forget their dangers, to look upon them with ridicule or contempt, or to discharge ourselves of all responsibility with regard to them, as if we were quite sure that *not the Reformation*, but the *destruction* of that Church, is the proper object of our hopes, and that to pray for them, or labour in order to convince them of their errors, forms no part of our Christian duty?

Let us acknowledge, in humility, before the great Searcher of hearts, my brethren, that we are guilty in this thing. True, we may have nothing in our power. True, our lectures, and our kind wishes, and our prayers, may have no influence whatever. But what then? Was it not good for the apostle to long for the salvation of the Jews, since they were his brethren according to the flesh, although they had rejected and crucified the Lord of life and glory? Nay, did not his fervent zeal in their behalf induce him to say, that he could even con-

sent to be accursed after the manner of Christ, that is, actually crucified, if he could thereby become the means of their salvation? How much more should we feel for the various Churches of Christ, who are our brethren through the principles of that faith which we hold in common? If they have added the corrupt doctrines of human invention to the sacred articles of the eternal Gospel—if those additions be full of impiety and peril—if they need to be enlightened, instructed, and led back to the pure fountains of unerring truth, and to the primitive Church of which they once formed so bright a portion—let us *pray* for them, with something like the spirit of the apostle, even if we fall immeasurably behind him in zeal. And let us not doubt, that if it should please the all-wise and all-powerful God to carry the principles of the Reformation into the Church of Rome, and through her extensive instrumentality, into the Church of Greece, the unity of Christendom would go farther to secure the conversion of the heathen, and the universal influence of holiness and virtue, than all the separate efforts of jarring and discordant sects can ever effect, though they could be multiplied an hundred-fold.

But no more. Our next subject, brethren, will be the doctrines of purgatory and indulgences, in addition to which, a few lectures more will bring us, I trust, to the close of the series. May the blessing of the King, eternal, immortal, and invisible, rest upon you; and may his Word go forth in its might, conquering and to conquer, until every form of error is banished from his Universal Church, until “the heathen shall be given to him for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession.”

LECTURE XIII.

LUKE xvi. 22, 23.—And it came to pass that the beggar died, and he was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom. And the rich man also died, and he was buried in hell. And lifting up his eyes when he was in torments, he saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. (Doway version.)

AMONGST all those doctrines which are regarded as corrupt abuses in the Church of Rome, my brethren, there are none possessing greater interest, and none of higher practical importance to their system, than the doctrines of purgatory, satisfaction, and indulgences. To understand them aright, will require more than ordinary attention from those who have not already some familiarity with the controversy; but I shall take all the pains in my power to make my statements perspicuous and plain. To this end, I shall discuss the subject in the following order: first, the theoretical doctrine of purgatory; secondly, the doctrine of satisfaction; thirdly, the doctrine of indulgences. I shall next examine the arguments adduced from Scripture to sustain these articles of their creed, and demonstrate, as I trust, their utter insufficiency. The translation used, will of course be understood to be their own Doway Bible, and their doctrines shall be stated from their own books of authority.

“Five receptacles are enumerated for the disembodied souls of the dead,” saith the learned author who finished the Theological Summary of Thomas Aquinas, “in which they are

received according to their respective states; namely, paradise, the limbus of the fathers, purgatory, hell, and the limbus of children." (Sup. 3, p. 269, Art. 7.)

"These abodes," saith the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "are not all of the same nature." Gehenna, the bottomless pit, or what is strictly called hell, "is that most loathsome and dark prison in which the souls of the damned are buried with the unclean spirits in eternal and unextinguishable fire." Next is "the fire of purgatory, in which the souls of just men are cleansed by a temporary punishment, in order to be admitted into their eternal country, into which nothing defiled entereth." (Cat. Trident. p. 63.)

And this punishment, though not eternal, is by fire, which, saith the Church of Rome, "is painful in a wondrous degree; surpassing every punishment which any one ever suffered in this life." (Philpot's Letters to Butler, 117.) Here then we see, that purgatory is not only a *state*, but a *place* of punishment for the departed soul: that the punishment is *by fire*, and that it exceeds all the pains known or ever experienced by the body.

It is to be especially observed, in order to a proper understanding of the doctrine, that the souls thus tormented in this purgatorial fire, are not the souls of the wicked, for they are consigned to the eternal fire of hell; but the souls of pious persons. The Council of Trent calls them "the souls of truly penitent and justified sinners;" and the Council of Florence pronounces them to be "the souls of those who, having truly repented, die in the love of God." (Ib.) You will not understand, however, that the Church of Rome condemns all departed souls to this purgatory. For persons of uncommon holiness, especially the apostles, martyrs, confessors, and saints, are placed, according to their doctrine, immediately in heaven; and made participators of the glory of Christ, without waiting for the resurrection of the body in the day of judgment. But

these form a comparative few; so that the great mass of departed Christians are believed by them to be necessarily obliged to spend a longer or a shorter period in the dreadful torments of these purgatorial flames, until satisfaction is rendered to the justice of God for their venial sins, as well as for the temporal punishment due to their mortal sins, after their guilt has been absolved and forgiven.

This brings us, brethren, to the doctrine of Satisfaction; a doctrine peculiar to the Church of Rome, out of which is constructed the marvellous system of works performed by the living for the benefit of the dead, and applied to them in certain forms by the priests, the bishops, and the saints, but most extensively by the popes in what are usually termed Indulgences.

The explanation of this doctrine I shall give you in the words of Dr. Wiseman:

“We believe,” saith he, “that upon the forgiveness of sins, that is, after the remission of that eternal debt, which God, in his justice, awards to transgressions against his law, he has been pleased to reserve a certain degree of inferior or temporary punishment, appropriate to the guilt which had been incurred, and it is on this part of the punishment, according to the Roman Catholic doctrine, that satisfaction can be made to God.”—“Herein consists that *self-sufficiency*, that *power of self-justification*, which has been considered sufficient to account for the Roman Catholic’s subjecting himself to the painful work of repentance, (or rather penance,) imposed upon him by his religion.” (Vol. II. 31.)

“This,” saith our author a little farther on, “is the basis of the system known by the name of the penitential canons; in which those who had transgressed were condemned to different punishments, according to the measure of their offences; some being obliged to lie prostrate for a certain term of months or years before the doors of the Church, after which they were admitted to different portions of the divine service; while others

were often excluded through their whole lives from the liturgical exercises of the faithful, and were not admitted to absolution until they were at the point of death.”—“And what is all this,” asks Dr. Wiseman, “but the doctrine of SATISFACTION, *the belief in the power of man to make some reparation or atonement to God, by his own voluntary sufferings?*” Mark this, brethren, I beseech you, because it is a clear avowal of the principle, which is elsewhere ingeniously concealed. We shall show, I trust, the utterly dangerous and unscriptural nature of this principle by and by: but we wish you, meanwhile, to carry it in your memory, as the fundamental error which supports the whole. And we shall now proceed to the mode, in which, according to our author, this is applied to the doctrine of Indulgences.

“What then,” asks Dr. Wiseman, “is an indulgence? It is no more than a remission by the Church, in virtue of the keys, or the judicial authority committed to her, of a portion, or the entire of the temporal punishment due to sin. The infinite merits of Christ form the fund whence this remission is derived: but besides this, the Church holds, that by the communion of saints, *penitential works performed by the just, beyond what their own sins might exact, are available to other members of Christ’s mystical body*; that, for instance, the sufferings of the spotless mother of God, afflictions such as probably no other human being ever felt in the soul—the austerities and persecutions of the Baptist, the friend of the Bridegroom, who was sanctified in his mother’s womb, and chosen to be an angel before the face of Christ—the tortures endured by numberless martyrs, whose lives had been pure from vice and sin—the prolonged rigours of holy anchorites, who, flying from the temptations and dangers of the world, passed many years in penance and contemplation—all these, made consecrated and valid through their union with the merits of Christ’s passion, were not thrown away, but formed *a store*

of meritorious blessings, applicable to the satisfaction of other sinners." Here, brethren, we have, what in the language of divines is called, the doctrine of *works of supererogation*; that is, the notion that the saints did and suffered a vast deal which was not required for their own sake, but which forms a sort of stock of merits, for the benefit of others, of which the pope has the supreme right of disposing to those believers who have not sufficient merits of their own; thus enabling them to satisfy the justice of God for all the *temporal* punishment which remains due to their sins, after the *eternal* punishment has been forgiven.

But still we have not arrived at the link in the doctrine, which connects the temporal satisfaction for sin, and the indulgence by which it is discharged, with purgatory. And therefore you must further observe, that this punishment, although called temporal, and in the case of the penitential discipline of the primitive Church always ended at death, has yet been carried beyond the grave by the Church of Rome, and extended to the whole period of the intermediate state, up to the day of judgment; so that whatever portion of this temporal satisfaction the believer may leave unpaid in this life, he must pay to the full, by suffering in purgatory. The Church of Rome however asserts, that this application of the superabundant merits of Christ and the saints may be made after death as well as before; and that the amount of the satisfaction thus rendered, will relieve the suffering soul from an equivalent amount of purgatorial torment. So that the power of the pope and the priesthood, is thus marvellously carried beyond the limits of the Church on earth, into the unseen world of spirits; and is even believed to exert *there*, its most surprising and important efficacy. This is evident from the simple consideration, that whereas the utmost stretch of ecclesiastical favour on earth, could only relieve from the satisfactory penances or punishments of the sinner's *life-time*, the Church

of Rome undertakes to commute, by her indulgences, the far more excruciating torments of the fire of purgatory, *for hundreds and thousands of years*, and even to put an end to them altogether by what she terms a plenary indulgence, or satisfaction in full.

The precise details and actual operation of these doctrines, brethren, must be reserved for another lecture; but I shall now proceed to examine the arguments by which they are sustained, commencing with their notion of satisfaction for sin, which Dr. Wiseman has well called the *power of self-justification*.

“The doctrine which is collected from the Word of God,” saith our learned author in relation to this subject, “is reducible to these heads. 1. That God, after the remission of sin, retains a lesser chastisement in his power, to be inflicted on the sinner. 2. That penitential works, fasting, alms-deeds, contrite weeping, and fervent prayer, have the power of averting that punishment. 3. That this scheme of God’s justice was not a part of the imperfect law, but the unvarying ordinance of his dispensation, anterior to the Mosaic ritual, and amply confirmed by Christ in his Gospel. 4. That it consequently becomes a part of all true repentance to try to satisfy this divine justice, by the voluntary assumption of such penitential works, as his revealed truth assures us have efficacy before him.”

You will observe, brethren, as the great characteristics of this whole scheme, these two most objectionable propositions: First, that the satisfaction rendered to the divine justice is divided between Christ and the sinner;—the Saviour takes the eternal portion of this satisfaction, but the temporal portion is to be rendered by man. Secondly, that this satisfaction is not to be made by obeying the commands of God and submitting to his chastisements, but by voluntary works and sufferings, undertaken by the sinner. Both of these posi-

tions we hold to be altogether opposed to Scripture, and without any authority amongst the best writers of the primitive Church. Our learned author, however, undertakes to sustain his doctrine, as usual, both by Scripture and tradition. And his Scriptural proofs are as follows:—That Moses and Aaron were not permitted to enter the promised land. That David was temporally punished for his sin, as well by the death of his child as by other calamities, notwithstanding the sin itself was forgiven. That Job, after he had transgressed, humbled himself in dust and ashes. That the men of Nineveh published a general fast for three days, from the king on his throne to the beasts in their stalls, saying: Who can tell if God will turn and forgive, and will turn away from his fierce anger, that we perish not. Nay, Dr. Wiseman even refers to our first parents in paradise as an example, because he says that their sin was forgiven, and yet the most bitter consequences were entailed on them and their posterity.

The passages from the New Testament which our author cites in justification of his doctrine, are partly negative, and partly positive. Assuming that his system was the existing system of the Mosaic dispensation, he argues, that our Saviour introduced no change in this respect, but rather recommended penitential works, such as fasting, both by precept and example. And St. Paul, writing to the Colossians, declares, “I now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up those things which are wanting of the sufferings of Christ, in my flesh, for his body which is the Church.” “What is *wanting* of Christ’s sufferings?” exclaims Dr. Wiseman, “and this to be supplied by man and in his flesh! What sort of doctrine call we this? Is it in favour of the completeness of Christ’s sufferings, as to their application? Or rather does it not suppose that much is to be done by man, towards possessing himself of the treasures laid up in our Saviour’s redemption; and that *suffering* is the means whereby this application is made?” Here, brethren,

our learned author really seems to think that his argument is triumphant, since he imagines it clearly manifested in Scripture. Whereas, I am much deceived, if a little, and but a little sober examination will not fully prove, that the testimony he has alleged is either wholly irrelevant, or else positively against him. But before I enter upon the particular passages relied on, let me premise a general remark, applicable to the whole subject, namely, that we hold it altogether contrary to the honour of the Gospel to consider our temporal afflictions as being, in any degree or sense whatever, a *satisfaction to the justice of God*. That can be rendered by nothing but the atonement and righteousness of our blessed Redeemer, applied to the believer by repentance and faith, after suitable acts of confession, humiliation, and prayer. Neither do I see how Dr. Wiseman's doctrine can be supported by any analogy with the acts of earthly governments. He observes, indeed, that where the law "would inflict the severest punishment, mercy steps in and pardons; but some slight and passing chastisement is imposed, as a satisfaction to public justice." (P. 36.) Of such a mode of granting pardons, brethren, we know nothing. And if it has been practised by the absolute governments of Europe, which I greatly doubt, yet sure I am that it never could have been viewed in the light of a *satisfaction to the government*. Such a commutation of punishment may have been imposed, as a satisfaction to what Dr. Wiseman calls public justice, meaning, I presume, public *feeling or opinion*. But there is no way of satisfying public *justice* that ever we heard of, by pardoning an acknowledged offender; although cases may be imagined in which the public sympathies would be satisfied by an exchange of a heavier for a lighter sentence. Surely, however, it requires no argument to show, that to talk about satisfying *justice* by any thing else than a full equivalent for the sentence pronounced, is a mere darkening of counsel by words without knowledge. And if we may not trifle thus with the

principles of earthly justice, how much more are we bound not to trifle with the justice of God!

There is, therefore, only one view of the subject, in which the use of the phrase *satisfaction* is at all appropriate; namely, when the interests of society, of the Church, and of our fellow sinners, are considered. This was, doubtless, the main ground of the old penitential canons, which prohibited offenders from entering the Church, and inflicted public penance upon them for months, for years, or even for life, according to the enormity of their transgression. It was not that they thought sinners were able, in this way, to satisfy even the temporal requirements of the justice of God, as Dr. Wiseman would persuade us; but it was in order to satisfy the Church on earth, to have proof of the sinner's thorough repentance and amendment, to vindicate the holiness of the gospel in the eyes of the heathen around them, and to deter others from sin by these spectacles of salutary public humiliation. And hence we find a perfect contrast in the mode of proceeding, when we compare the system of the ancient, with that of the modern Church of Rome. For the ancient Church never pronounced the absolution of the sinner *until the period of this discipline was ended*, unless the penitent was at the point of death. Whereas, the modern Church of Rome pronounces the absolution immediately on *receiving the confession*; appoints her light and trifling penances to be performed afterwards, at the option of the offender; and then tells us that the measure of temporal punishment, actually due to the unsatisfied justice of God, will be exacted after death in the fires of purgatory. Now, it is perfectly incomprehensible to me, how, under such circumstances, any intelligent mind could imagine, that the penitential canons of the primitive Church were based on the same principles as the modern Roman theory.

But it is time that we attend to the authorities which our ingenious advocate thinks he has alleged from Scripture. Com-

mencing with Adam and Eve, Dr. Wiseman informs us, that after their sin was forgiven, God inflicted temporal punishments on them and their posterity. In this hypothesis, however, there is an assertion that cannot be proved, namely, that the sin of Adam and Eve was forgiven. This part of the case is pure conjecture. We do not read of their confession, nor of their repentance, nor of their faith in the promised Redeemer. The first believer mentioned by St. Paul is Abel, their son; and therefore, if there were no other objection, it is clear that this citation can have nothing to do with the Roman doctrine. Independently of this difficulty, however, there is another, still greater. For our learned author's theory requires not only the fact, that the Lord forgives the sinner, and afterwards punishes the sin in the present life; but that this temporal punishment *extends beyond the grave*, and that although the departed soul can do nothing in its suffering state to help itself, yet *satisfaction may be rendered by the Church on its behalf*, by penances, alms, masses, prayers, and especially by indulgences. How many of these points, in honesty, does our author think he can prove by the case of Adam and Eve?

The instance of Moses and Aaron, deprived, for a comparatively light transgression, in Dr. Wiseman's esteem, of the privilege of entering the land of Canaan, labours under equal difficulties, although not precisely of the same description. For I suppose our ingenious arguer would hardly consider the peaceful and blessed death of these saints, full of years and glory, as a temporal punishment for their sin, when contrasted with the cares, and strifes, and hardships, of the government of Israel. True it was, indeed, that the denial of Moses' request, and the giving the honour of his commission to Joshua, just on the borders of the promised land, was a proof to all Israel that God is no respecter of persons; and the recital affords a further proof of the admirable integrity of the record, in which Moses himself erects the perpetual memorial of his own shame.

But it must be a pure effort of the imagination, as it seems to me, that can discover in this narrative any thing like a *temporal punishment* awarded to the patriarch, in order to satisfy the justice of the Almighty.

The third case cited by Dr. Wiseman is that of David, in which, after the confession and repentance of the royal Psalmist, the prophet saith to him, “The Lord also hath put away thy sin. Nevertheless, because, by this thing thou hast caused the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, the child that is born unto thee shall surely die.” We read that David wept and fasted, and lay all night upon the ground, trusting that the Almighty would yet take pity on him, and revoke his sentence by sparing the life of the child. And these acts Dr. Wiseman considers as an offering of *satisfaction to the justice of God* in one kind of suffering, in the hope that this might be accepted instead of the other. But there is no such idea intimated in the sacred history. Nor do I see how the royal penitent could be acquitted of the charge of impious presumption, if he was capable of seriously proposing to give the Lord a certain portion of weeping, and fasting, and watching, as an equivalent for the life of his child, which God had resolved to take away. No two things can be more opposite, in my apprehension, than the theory of the king, and that of our Roman advocate. The sorrowful monarch’s prayers and supplications were addressed, not to the *justice of the Deity*, but to the LOVE OF HIS HEAVENLY FATHER—to Him that was “merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and that repenteth him of the evil.” But Dr. Wiseman would have the whole brought into the commercial form of a *commutation of punishment*, a barter and exchange of one kind of suffering instead of another, addressed, by way of *satisfaction*, to the *justice* of God. Surely it is manifest that the sacred record gives no countenance to such an interpretation.

The fourth example is that of Job, which is supposed to be

in point, because the patriarch humbled himself, and repented in dust and ashes. But look at the whole case, and it will furnish an instance which is the very reverse of the Roman theory. For what our author has to prove, is, that *after* the sin is forgiven, the penitent is *temporally* punished, not only here, *but hereafter*. Whereas, in the case of Job, as soon as he repented, he was restored forthwith to all his temporal prosperity. Wealth flowed back upon him, his friends flocked around and gave him presents, he had again seven sons and three daughters; and the Lord blessed the latter end of Job more than his beginning. Nothing, therefore, can be more emphatically opposed to Dr. Wiseman's object, than the history of Job, when the whole is taken together.

The next attempt of our ingenious advocate to find Scriptural authority for his doctrine of penal and commutative satisfaction to the justice of God, is drawn from the history of the Ninevites, who, when the prophet Jonah proclaimed that in forty days their city should be destroyed, proclaimed a fast, humbled themselves, and even obliged the beasts in the stalls to partake of their voluntary mortification, by depriving them of food for three days together. In compassion and mercy, God allowed them a respite, and postponed the destruction of their idolatrous and wicked city, until the cup of its iniquity was filled by the next generation. How does this prove the Roman doctrine of satisfaction? Where is their fundamental proposition, that God *forgives sin as to its eternal consequences*, and afterwards inflicts *temporal punishment* upon the sinner? Can Dr. Wiseman prove that the sins of the Ninevites were forgiven at all? For certainly their alarm and their manifestation of sorrow do not amount to a proof, that they became proselytes to the worship of the God of Israel. Or can he seriously suppose, that three days' fasting of the Ninevites was such a *satisfaction to the justice of God*, that he accepted it as a sort of commutation for the destruction of their

city? Is it possible for any one to help seeing, that this was one of the innumerable examples in the Bible, where the tender compassion of that God whose name is Love, suspends the stroke of his justice, even although it is sure to descend at last? Alas! brethren, can any error in doctrine be more pernicious than this, which turns the very pity of the Lord into an imaginary judicial calculation, and makes three days' suffering of penance in fasting and sackcloth, a discharge in full of the temporal debt due to that fearful and tremendous attribute—the JUSTICE OF ALMIGHTY GOD?

But our author, having thus closed his list of proofs from the Old Testament, thinks that he finds corroboration in the encouragement given by our blessed Redeemer to fasting. Here, however, is the radical error of all such reasoning. Fasting and abstinence, with every other act of self-mortification mentioned in Scripture, such as wearing sackcloth, or covering the head with ashes, may be used and often have been used, for reasons which had not the slightest reference to the Roman doctrine of satisfaction. First, as an exercise of authority by the soul over the body, according to St. Paul. "I keep my body under," saith he, "and bring it into subjection;" the believer designing in this way, to confirm, as it were, by habit and practice, the dominion of the spirit over the flesh. Secondly, as a useful act of self-denial, to conquer certain common propensities to sin. As, for example, intemperance in eating and drinking, or the sin of gluttony, was directly combated in the act of fasting; while vanity and pride in personal appearance and apparel, were directly combated in the wearing of sackcloth and the covering of ashes. And thirdly, these acts of mortifying discipline might be designed as an open acknowledgment of the penitent's share in the common guilt and danger, which was the principle of those public and general acts of humiliation of which we read in Scripture. Now here are three motives for these penitential

observances, sufficient in themselves, and yet perfectly distinct from the strange corruption of the Church of Rome, which can see nothing in them but a *satisfaction* or *discharge* of a certain portion of the *debt due to God's justice*; thus converting the very discipline of our fleshly appetites into a claim of merit, and persuading the sinner that he has done something towards the stupendous work of atonement for sin, which the infinite love and majesty of the Lord Jesus Christ were alone able to perform.

While, therefore, we can thus assign valid and sufficient reasons for the occasional austerities of the Old Testament saints, we deny that there was any thing in their lives like the Roman notion of satisfaction, where every voluntary act of suffering is regarded as a positive payment of so much of the debt due to God's justice, either for themselves or for others. Hence, too, in the instructions of our blessed Lord, while the whole weight of his authority is directed against the Pharisaical practice of fasting for ostentation and display, he adds no new day of fasting to the Mosaic ritual; he gives no precept in favour of sackcloth or ashes, nor does he prescribe a single rule of bodily suffering or self-mortification. Nor is there one of his apostles who recommends any regulation of the kind, as a law to be bound upon the Church. But if the Roman doctrine be true—if penitential voluntary works, performed by the sinner himself during life, or by the Church after his death, were necessary to discharge the *temporal debt due to God's justice*, over and above the atonement of Christ,—and if, for want of these, temporal afflictions in this world, and the excruciating fires of purgatory beyond the grave up to the very day of judgment, might be the lot even of the righteous, how does it happen that the blessed Saviour and his inspired apostles should have left so much of all other doctrine to the Church, without saying one word on so important a matter?

But let me not forget, brethren, that Dr. Wiseman gives us

one other passage from Scripture, which he seems to think conclusive in his favour, and therefore it must be considered with all due attention. It is the passage in which the great apostle, writing to the Colossians, declares: "I now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up those things which are wanting of the sufferings of Christ, in my flesh, for his body, which is the Church." Now this text, like a very large portion of St. Paul's writings, is elliptical and somewhat obscure; reminding us of what St. Peter records, when he saith, that in his beloved brother Paul's epistles, "there are some things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction." Nevertheless, there is nothing in it which at all militates against our doctrine, or lends any support to the theory of human justification, which our learned advocate would rest on its authority. Let us examine it thoroughly, and I trust you will see that it teaches a very different lesson.

Three propositions are distinctly marked in the sentence: first, that the apostle rejoices in his sufferings; secondly, that he calls these sufferings a filling-up of those things which are wanting of the sufferings of Christ in his flesh; thirdly, that this is for the benefit of Christ's Church, which is his body.

On the first point there can be no room for cavil. Our gracious Redeemer himself said: "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven." In perfect agreement with this, we find that the apostles, when they had been scourged and imprisoned for preaching Christ, "rejoiced that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name." And St. James has recorded the same principle where he saith: "Beloved, count it all joy when ye fall into divers trials, knowing that the trial of your faith worketh patience, and patience hope." Here we have a general princi-

ple, lying at the very root of all religion. We must sow in tears, if we would reap in joy. "Through tribulation," saith Christ, "ye must enter into the kingdom of heaven." "If we suffer with Christ," saith St. Paul, "we shall also reign with him." And again: "Our light affliction, which endures but for a moment, worketh out for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory."

Thus far, the meaning of the passage is sufficiently plain. But now comes the second proposition, that the apostle calls his sufferings, "a filling up of those things which are wanting of the sufferings of Christ in his flesh." Here, it is evident, that the words, taken by themselves, might be thought to signify a deficiency in the amount of Christ's sufferings, which was to be supplied by St. Paul. But this is an absurdity which the Church of Rome would by means tolerate. So far from it, that she undertakes to pronounce, as you will see by and by, that our Lord suffered *much more than was necessary*, for one drop of his blood was sufficient to atone for the sins of the whole world; and therefore the rest, as they imagine, has been laid up along with the superfluous good works of the saints, as a treasure to supply the deficiencies of merit in Christians at large. It is plainly impossible, therefore, for Dr. Wiseman to ask, that we shall believe that there was a *deficiency* in Christ's sufferings, since clearly there cannot be, at the same time, a *superabundance and a deficiency of the very same thing*. This interpretation, therefore, being discarded by both sides, we must look for another; and that brethren, we can readily find in the beautiful and affecting announcement of the same apostle, where he saith to the Hebrews, "We have not an High Priest who cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, but was tempted in all points like as we are, and yet without sin." Christ Jesus, our great High Priest, although the atoning sufferings of his own sacred Person are over, still *sympathizes with the suffer-*

ings of his people, and considers them his own. It is one of the precious privileges resulting from the completeness of our union with him, from which union flows our only hope of salvation. To express this most essential principle of the believer's life, every metaphor and allegory of language are exhausted. If he is the vine, we are the branches. If he is the rock, we are the living stones built upon it. If he is the Bridegroom, his Church is the Bride. He gives us his flesh to eat, his blood to drink; he enters into our hearts by his Spirit, and dwells there that we may be one with him. In his own description of the judgment day, he accounts every act of kindness performed for the least of his people, a charity done to his own person; every injury and neglect, a wrong to himself: "Verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it to the least among my brethren, ye did it unto me." But none of these metaphors is more full of expression than that which St. Paul so often uses, and especially in the passage before us; where Christ is the head, and his Church is the body, and each particular Christian is a member of that body. Here, then, we have a simple key to the whole of this seeming mystery. Christ, in his own glorious Person, God and man, satisfied all the claims of divine justice against our ruined race, by his precious and perfect obedience and death. To that end, his sufferings were all sufficient, and no creature is entitled to share with him in the very least portion of that mighty and stupendous redemption. But his people can only be made partakers of the immortality and bliss thus purchased for them, by becoming united with him; and this union requires not only the powerful and regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit to change their hearts, but also the discipline of trials and sufferings, that they may learn to know, and love, and resemble HIM, in holiness and virtue. Understanding, therefore, to what end this discipline is appointed, his saints rejoice in it. That very suffering over which the worldly

heart laments and mourns, gives them an occasion of thanksgiving, because *they are not alone*. Christ looks on their sufferings with tender compassion. Christ appoints those sufferings for their good. Christ is touched with a feeling of their very infirmities. Does the fond mother feel no emotion at the pains of her beloved child? Does not every moan of its anguish, every cry of its agony, produce an answering pang at her very heart-strings? Yet the love of Christ is stronger than this strongest of human affections: "When thy father and thy mother forsake thee, the Lord taketh thee up." Nay, there is a peculiarity in the case of the Christian's relation to his Saviour, to which no earthly relationship can afford a parallel. For he is a member of that body of which Christ is the head. And can the member suffer, without the head? Even though the actual seat of the pain be in the farthest extremity of the body, can the head avoid feeling as if it were its own? And while the body or any member of it continues to suffer, is there not truly something remaining for the head to suffer with it?

Thus then, brethren, the doctrine of St. Paul, in this second proposition, is seen to be a consistent, pure and inestimable part of the Christian's consolation, during his earthly pilgrimage, without the slightest approximation to the unhappy error which the Church of Rome seeks to render plausible, under its supposed authority. And the third point in the text presents still less difficulty, namely, where the apostle saith, that his sufferings are for the Church; that is, *on account of the Church*, or for the Church's benefit. That the persecutions, stripes, imprisonment, and final martyrdom of the apostles, were on account of the Church, is sufficiently plain from the simple fact, that they were all endured in the work of preaching the gospel of salvation to every creature. That they were all for the benefit of the Church is equally plain; because it was chiefly through them, that the power of divine grace was dis-

played in so irresistible a manner, that Jews and Gentiles were alike compelled to acknowledge the work to be of God. And they were equally beneficial to the Church in the edifying example thus placed before believers, for nothing could bring Christians so effectually to the necessary practice of self-denial; nothing induce them so powerfully to live above the world, to take joyfully the spoiling of their own goods, to bear patiently the cross of persecution, to remember that on earth they were but strangers and pilgrims, seeking an eternal and celestial habitation, and thus to show forth their own light before men, so that they, seeing the good works of the faithful, might be led to seek their Father in heaven—nothing, in a word, could have a happier influence upon the whole course of the Church at large, than the spectacle of the apostles, forgetting self in the promotion of the common welfare, and even rejoicing in sufferings for the flock committed to their care. What is there in all this that looks like the Roman Catholic doctrine of *satisfaction to the justice of God by voluntary acts of penance and suffering*, performed *after* sin is forgiven, in order to *avoid* the infliction of *temporal chastisement in this life, or the torment of fire in the life to come?*

Having thus examined at length, brethren, the Scriptural evidence adduced for the doctrine of *satisfaction*, because I hold it to be of such high importance among those errors which we are obliged to charge upon the Church of Rome, I have next to present to your attention the proof which our learned author adduces on the subject of *purgatory*. And here, he begins with the custom of prayers for the dead, citing, for proof, the second book of Maccabees, which, as Dr. Wiseman justly observes, is at least entitled to respect as a history of the Jewish people, anterior to the coming of the Saviour. The passage is in the 12th chapter, and gives an account of a battle fought by Judas Maccabeus, the commander of the Jewish army, against Gorgias, the governor of Idumea, in which some of the Jews

were slain, although Judas obtained a splendid victory. The day after the battle, he came with his soldiers to bury his dead; "and they found," saith the historian, "under the coats of the slain, some of the (donaries) or things consecrated to the idols of Jamnia, which their law forbiddeth to the Jews; so that all plainly saw that for this cause they were slain. Then they all blessed the just judgment of the Lord, who had discovered the things that were hidden; and so betaking themselves to prayers, they besought him that the sin which had been committed might be forgotten. But Judas sent 12,000 drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice, to be offered for the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection. It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sin."

Now there is one serious difficulty about this whole matter, namely, that the book in which it is contained possesses no canonical authority, because it was never reckoned amongst their inspired writings by the Jews themselves, who are the only proper judges of the Scriptures belonging to the Old Testament. Neither was it so reckoned in the best catalogues of the primitive Church. Therefore, the reflections of the historian upon the conduct of Judas Maccabeus, have no force beyond the notions of any other nameless author. The facts, however, in the main, we suppose to be correctly stated. That the battle was fought, that the victory was gained, and that the slain Jews were found to have been secret *idolators* by the consecrated things discovered on their persons, may all be admitted. Neither do we deny the probability, at least, that Judas and his company prayed for the dead, and sent money to have sacrifices offered on their behalf at Jerusalem. But the inference which Dr. Wiseman would draw from it, that such was the doctrine of the Jews in our Saviour's days, and that he never reprov'd it, is entirely unwarrantable. For, in the first place, our Lord did reprove them sharply, for

making void the law of God by their traditions, of which he stated one or two instances, saying, in conclusion, "and many other such like things ye do;" from which we learn that there were a variety of corruptions which the Saviour did not then specify; and it is at least likely that this was amongst them, since it is very certain that the law of Moses gave no authority nor sanction to sacrifices for the dead. There is another argument, however, which ought to be conclusive with Dr. Wiseman: namely, that the doctrine of the historian on whom he relies, is not in agreement with the Church of Rome at all; although the passage is so constantly quoted in her favour. For there can be no question that these Jews, whose story is related in the book of Maccabees, *died in idolatry*; and that the Church of Rome holds this to be *a mortal sin*, the commission of which, if not renounced by repentance and confession, certainly takes the soul, according to their own doctrine, *not to purgatory, but to hell*, out of which there is no redemption. It results, therefore, that the Church of Rome could not justify the doctrine of this book of Maccabees on her own principles. Consequently, the case proves quite too much for their purpose; and hence, by the rules of logic, it must be taken to prove nothing.

Our author's next quotation is from the passage where our Lord, speaking of the sin against the Holy Ghost, saith; "it shall not be *forgiven*, neither in this world, nor in the world to come:" from which he concludes that there are some sins which may be *forgiven in the future state*. In answer to this it is surely enough to observe, that it can have no possible bearing on their doctrine of purgatory, understand it how we may. Because we have seen that the Church of Rome assigns purgatory, and voluntary penances, and prayers for the dead, to those *whose sins are forgiven in this life*; but who have to satisfy the justice of God as to the *temporal* penalty due to them, *after* the eternal penalty is completely remitted in

absolution. Hence they utterly deny that the relief of the souls in purgatory is by way of *forgiveness* or *absolution of sin*, and insist that it is solely by way of *satisfaction* or *payment*; the superabundant merits of Christ and the saints, which constitute the treasure of the Church, being applied to the debt which the departed soul owes to the divine justice, and thus extinguishing it in the manner of an offset, in the business of men. Hence it is manifest, that this text is as little suited to their doctrine as any thing can be, even if we granted, what is more than doubtful, that their interpretation was correct.

There is one passage more, in which St. Paul speaks of the believer's having built upon the true foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble. (1 Cor. iii. 13.) "Every man's work," saith the apostle, "shall be made manifest, for the day of the Lord shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work burn, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." From this, our Roman advocates gather the doctrine of purgatory with more confidence, than from any thing else in Scripture. And yet, brethren, there are several arguments against such an interpretation, which appear to my mind perfectly irresistible. For, in the first place, the apostle speaks of the fire, as trying *every man's work*, as well the gold, silver, and jewels, as the wood, hay, and stubble. This cannot therefore be the fire of purgatory, which never detains the saints, but only the ordinary believers. Secondly, the apostle speaks of the fire as revealing the quality of our works in connexion with the day of the Lord, that is, as all agree, the day of judgment, when the souls of men, re-united to their bodies, shall stand before the tribunal of Christ. But this cannot be the purgatorial fire of the Church of Rome, which has always been

burning, as they say, for the punishment of souls without bodies, and shall continue to burn until the day of judgment, at which time it is to cease. Thirdly, the apostle applies the fire of which he speaks to the *works* of men. But the Church of Rome applies her purgatorial fires to the souls themselves. Fourthly, the effect of the fire mentioned by the apostle is to burn the wood, the hay and the stubble, that is, to consume the vain and worthless doings of the earthly minded, the hollow pretences of our own imaginary zeal or orthodoxy, as well as all the superstitious inventions which Christians may have built upon the true foundation of Christ. But the purgatorial fire of the Church of Rome is designed to *torture*, not to *consume*. And lastly, the effect of the fire of which the apostle warns us, depends upon the quality of our own works, but the fire of purgatory is influenced, according to the Church of Rome, not by our own works, but by the works of others; for while the departed soul is perfectly incapable of doing any thing to help himself, the Church on earth can assist him, by masses and prayers, and the pope is able to relieve him entirely, by the application of the treasure of the Church; so that the merits of the saints, united to the superfluous merits of Christ, shall straightway bring him to the mansions of glory. We see, therefore, brethren, that it is not possible, by any fair interpretation, to suppose that the apostle, in this passage, alluded to the doctrine long afterwards introduced, and finally used for so many important purposes by the Church of Rome. The truth is that this celebrated text is probably descriptive of the divine judgment. "Our God," saith the same apostle in his epistle to the Hebrews, "is a consuming fire." "He shall sit," saith the prophet Malachi, "like a refiner's fire and like fuller's soap:" (Mal. iii. 2.) the fire representing the consuming of what should be destroyed, the soap representing the cleansing of what should remain. Again: "Are not my words as a fire," saith the Lord by the prophet Jeremiah. (xxiii. 29.)

And the day of judgment is always presented in this connexion; St. Peter declaring, that "the earth and the works that are therein shall be burnt up;" (2 Pet. iii. 10) and St. Paul, that "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed in a flame of fire, giving vengeance to them who know not God." (2 Thes. i. 8.) How clear and consistent, therefore, is the interpretation which is suggested by these and similar passages, that the fiery judgment of the great day shall burn all the earthly works, and thoughts, and inventions of Christians, which, like so much wood, hay and stubble, they shall have foolishly and sinfully built upon the foundation of Jesus Christ; while, nevertheless, if they have held that sure foundation, they shall be saved, yet so as by fire, like brands plucked from the burning. And on the other hand, that those who have built upon that foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, that is, who have laid up their treasures in heaven, and honoured the Lord with all their faculties, and means, and powers, shall receive a reward, and shall shine as the stars for ever. For there is, doubtless, an ascending and a descending scale prepared for the tremendous and glorious manifestations of that awful day, by which the happiness of the redeemed and the misery of the lost will be graduated with the utmost precision. "In my Father's house," saith Christ, "are many mansions." And "one star differeth from another star," saith St. Paul, "in glory."

Seeing, then, brethren, that the passages cited by the Church of Rome from the Word of God, when fairly examined, lend no support whatever to her doctrine of purgatory, let us turn to the positive testimony of our blessed Saviour, in our text; where, speaking on the very point, in the beautiful and most instructive parable of the rich man and Lazarus, he describes to us two states for the departed soul, and two only. "For it came to pass," saith our Lord, "that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom. And the rich man also died, and was buried in hell. And lifting up his

eyes when he was in torments, he saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom." Here we have paradise on the one hand, with the spirits of the just, in peace, in comfort, and in joyful expectation of the day of glory. And hell upon the other hand, with the spirits of the lost, the unbelieving, the earthly, the sensual, the proud, who cared for nothing but to be clad in purple and fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day. But our Lord tells us nothing of purgatory, although the Church of Rome pronounces her *anathema* upon us, for not believing it. Ah, brethren! when HE shall come again, in flaming fire, to take vengeance on his enemies, shall we have any cause to fear his censure, because we rested our faith upon his own Word, refusing either to add to it, or to take away? I trow not.

But we must release you now, from any farther discussion of these important articles of the Roman Catholic creed. The testimony of the fathers, and the history of the rise and progress of purgatory and indulgences, together with the position in which the doctrines stand at the present day, must be postponed until our next lecture. Meanwhile, beloved brethren, let us increase in the ardour and constancy of our prayers, if not for the dead, who need them not, yet for the living who are still in the flesh, surrounded by temptation. And especially on behalf of the Universal or Catholic Church, let us earnestly beseech the God of all grace to hasten the time, when his own perfect and unerring Word shall be the only standard of faith throughout the length and breadth of Christendom; when truth, and unity, and peace, and love, shall break down every partition wall of heresy and schism, and the whole host of his now divided and contending followers shall realize the blessedness of being but one fold, under the one divine SHEPHERD OF ISRAEL.

LECTURE XIV.

LUKE xvi. 22, 23.—And it came to pass that the beggar died, and he was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom. And the rich man also died, and he was buried in hell. And lifting up his eyes when he was in torments, he saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. (Doway version.)

OUR last lecture, beloved brethren, was devoted to the examination of the doctrine of purgatory, in connexion with the theory of satisfaction to the temporal justice of God, and the prerogative of discharging the soul of the departed believer from this debt of justice, which the Church of Rome asserts in the granting of indulgences. A brief recapitulation of the heads of that lecture may be necessary, in order to refresh your memory, and to enable me to resume the line of argument and evidence which was then commenced, and which I purpose to complete on the present occasion.

You will bear in mind, then, that the Church of Rome teaches the necessity of *satisfying the justice* of the Almighty, with respect to a certain measure of punishment, which, according to their doctrine, continues due in this life, after a full forgiveness of our sin has been obtained through the atonement and merits of Christ Jesus; for although they allow that the application of this atonement remits the *eternal* penalty of sin, yet they contend that there is a *temporal* penalty besides, which must be paid by the sinner himself, or by the Church

for him. The mode of rendering satisfaction for this debt of temporal justice, according to their creed, is by penitential works, fasting, mortification, alms-deeds, and prayers. And all the trials and afflictions of the present life are supposed to be available to the same purpose. But if the Christian departs without having fully paid the amount of penance and suffering which this debt of temporal justice requires, his soul must be tormented in the fire of purgatory until satisfaction is completely rendered. They hold, however, that the Church has an inexhaustible treasury of merits, which can be so applied as to extinguish this claim of God's temporal justice; and thus either shorten the sufferings of the soul in purgatory, or relieve it altogether. This treasury consists of the superfluous merits and sufferings of Christ, and of the saints: and thus the devotions, and masses, and offerings for the dead, operate with more or less efficacy upon these purgatorial punishments. While the pope has the most unlimited power, by his indulgence, to give the suffering soul the benefit of a satisfaction either for a part, or for the whole: the partial satisfaction, amounting to an acquittance of so many days, or months, or years, of the allotted period of torment; and the total satisfaction, which they call a *plenary indulgence*, being available to cancel the entire debt, and transfer the soul to heaven.

The passages of Scripture alleged as proving these doctrines, brethren, I considered at large; and showed, as I trust, sufficiently, that none of them could be truly interpreted in their favour; that a portion of them were quite irrelevant, and that others taught the very contrary. I then cited the text which, you are aware, forms a part of the narrative of the rich man and Lazarus; and stated, upon the authority of our blessed Redeemer, that there were but two conditions for the disembodied spirit; that of torment, with the lost, or that of refreshment, peace, and happiness with the redeemed, in the bosom of Abraham. I also endeavoured to explain the true design and

character of our earthly afflictions and trials, in order to prove that they were not in the nature of *penal satisfaction* in any case, but rather in that of a kind and paternal discipline, for the purpose of instructing us in the knowledge of ourselves, and in the character of that holiness without which none can see the Lord; weaning us from the love of earth and earthly things, and enabling us to realize the truth, that we are pilgrims and strangers here, whose hearts should be set upon our eternal home in heaven. It was left for the following discourse to complete this part of our discussion, by examining the next branch of the evidence on which the Church of Rome relies, namely, that of the ancient fathers; and by stating the history and progress of these doctrines prior to the Reformation, and their condition and influence in our own day. That I may do this with the greater perspicuity, I shall first notice the inference which they draw from the ancient custom of praying for the dead; next, their popular argument founded upon the use and necessity of an intermediate state; thirdly, the authority of the fathers; and fourthly, the statements of the modern champions of the Church of Rome, together with the present position of the whole question.

First, then, we are to notice the inference which they draw from the fact, that the ancient Church always included a prayer for the departed in their liturgies, so that it was a regular part of the communion service. It also appears to have been the usage of the Jews; and from the history of the Maccabees, which is supposed to be a true history, although not a part of the inspired and canonical Scriptures, this custom seems to have existed a considerable time before our Saviour's advent. Let these facts be granted therefore, since the evidence is certainly in their favour. But the inference derived from them by the Church of Rome is altogether a different matter. For they argue, ingeniously enough, that unless the departed soul were supposed to be in a suffering state, there was no occasion

for such prayers, nor could there be any possible use in offering them; and hence, concluding that the practice of praying for the dead must have grown out of the belief that their souls were in purgatory, they claim the benefit of all the proof which can be adduced in favour of the one, as being equally conclusive in favour of the other.

In this, however, as it appears to me, they commit an egregious mistake, since their whole argument turns upon the erroneous position, that there can be but one reason for praying on behalf of another, namely, because he is in a state of suffering from which we desire him to be relieved. Now, if this position be true, as respects prayer for the dead, it must be equally true as respects prayers for the living; and therefore we should not offer prayers for any of our brethren on earth, unless we believed them to be in a state of torment. But no allegation can be more absurd than this. The first great reason why we pray for others, is the imperative one, *because it is a part of the divine commandment*; and when we come to discuss the subordinate reasons which may be assigned for it, we find that they are various. One reason, indeed, accords with the Roman hypothesis, that our prayers, through the mercy of God, may relieve the subjects of them from pain and danger. Thus saith the apostle James: "Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he have committed sins they shall be forgiven him." And St. John saith, "If any one see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, let him ask, (or pray) and life shall be given to him." Here is the principle which approaches most nearly to the argument of the Church of Rome, because it contemplates the benefit obtained by our prayers for those who are suffering under pain, and the consequences of sin. But there is a very different kind of benefit suggested by St. Paul, where he tells

the Ephesians to persevere in prayer and supplication for all the saints, (Eph. vi. 19, 20,) and for me," saith he, especially, "that speech may be given me, that I may open my mouth with confidence, to make known the mystery of the Gospel,—so that therein I may be bold to speak, according as I ought." Here we perceive another sort of advantage expected from prayer;—not a relief from suffering, but an increase of ministerial graces. Thus far, therefore, we have plainly set before us three reasons for this duty: First, because it is the will of God; secondly, because our brethren are in affliction; and thirdly and chiefly, because their condition admits of an increase in holiness, in zeal, or in felicity. Now, of these three reasons, one only can possibly be applied to the doctrine of purgatory; and we shall see presently, when we examine the sort of prayers which the ancient Church offered for the departed, that they will not accord so well with this as with the others.

There is, however, a fourth reason why we should pray for our brethren, quite independent of any benefit which they may derive from our prayers; and this is, because, by such prayers, we cherish and increase, in our own souls, the graces of faith, hope, and charity. Our **FAITH** is increased, because we are reminded of the promises of that blessed Gospel which binds the whole Church to Christ, and connects our individual salvation with the accomplishment of the stupendous plan, which shall bring myriads to everlasting glory. Our **HOPE** is increased, because the very act of praying for the various portions of the universal Church, strengthens our longing for that *communion of saints*, which shall be perfected in the world to come, although here, it is liable to such constant interruption, and is, at best, so poorly realized. And it increases, above all, our **CHARITY**, or love to the brethren, because the act of prayer for them enkindles our spiritual affections on their behalf, and draws our souls towards them in the temper and disposition, which is our best preparative for heaven. Here then,

we have a most important reason for the precept to pray for each other, which regards chiefly the progress of our own sanctification; so that of the four motives assignable for such prayers, we perceive one only which can be made at all subservient to the Roman hypothesis, while the other three continue in full force, without the possibility of linking them to the doctrine of purgatory. In speaking thus, however, you will not understand me, I trust, as being an advocate for the practice of the ancient Church in this particular. The principle I have so often had occasion to set before you in religion, is to look for all truth in the written Word of God, as the **LAW**, and to take the primitive Church as the best *expounder* or *judge* of the sense of Scripture. But when the Scripture is *perfectly silent*, and neither in the Old Testament nor in the New, can a single authoritative sentence be found in favour of a practice, which appears, at best, to be of doubtful expediency, I have no idea of tying our faith to the custom of the ancient Church, as being a sufficient substitute for the Bible. For even with regard to the authority of the Church, we must distinguish carefully between the *ancient* and the *primitive* Christians, in an argument where we have no Scripture to guide us: and we must remember, especially, that none of the primitive liturgies have come down to us without many additions; that they were not published until the fifth century; that although all the Churches had liturgies, without any exception, and these were in harmony, as respected their principal parts, yet they differed considerably in their details, and that the earlier were confessedly the more simple.* Hence, while I fully approve the wisdom of our Reformers, who neither retained the prayers for the departed in our liturgy, on the one hand, nor pronounced any censure upon the ancient Church for using them, on the other, I desire to show you that the very ground on which the Church

* See Touttée, Preface to Cyril of Jerusalem, 23. Cat. p. 323-4.

of Rome rests her argument, can avail her nothing; and that such prayers, however unauthorized and inexpedient they may have been, might have been tolerated for reasons totally distinct from the doctrine of purgatory.

That you may distinctly see how far the ancient Church seems to have carried the practice of praying for the departed, I shall now present to you an extract from the Alexandrian liturgy, which bears the name of the celebrated Basil, bishop of Cesarea, and is printed with his works, although it is acknowledged to be of a later day. (Basil, Op. Tom. II. 676-80.)

First, we meet with it in the prayer which preceded the kiss of peace, where the officiating priest, speaking in reference to the symbols of our Lord's body and blood, saith, "Receive, O Lord, these holy gifts from our hands, although we are sinners, through thy goodness; and grant that they may be accepted, and sanctified by thy Holy Spirit, to the expiation of our sins, and the ignorances of thy people, and *to the rest of those souls who have departed this life.*"

The second appearance of the practice is much more in detail, and immediately preceded the *diptychs*, or sacred lists of the departed saints, which were constantly, in those days, read at the altar. The language is as follows:

"Remember, O Lord, those who now offer these precious gifts to thee, and those from whom, on account of whom, and through whom, they have been brought in. Grant unto them all, their heavenly reward; and according to the precept of thine only begotten Son, make us to communicate in the memory of the saints. Vouchsafe, O Lord, to remember those, who from the beginning, have pleased thee, the holy fathers, patriarchs, apostles, prophets, preachers, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, and every righteous soul who has finished his course in the faith of Christ."

"Chiefly the most holy, most glorious, immaculate, and most blessed Mary, the ever virgin mother of God."

“The holy and glorious prophet, precursor, and martyr, John the Baptist.”

“The holy Stephen, the first of the deacons and the first of the martyrs.”

“Our holy and blessed father, Mark, the apostle and evangelist, and our holy and wonder-working father Basil.”

“The holy saint, (N.) whose memory we celebrate this day, and the whole company of thy saints, by whose prayers and intercessions also we pray thee to have mercy upon us, and save us for the sake of thy holy name which is invoked upon us.”

Here the deacon reads the diptychs, that is, the lists of the departed faithful; and then the priest proceeds with the following prayer:

“In like manner, O Lord, remember all of the priesthood who have gone before, and those who were of the laity. Grant that all their souls may rest in the bosoms of our holy fathers Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Lead and gather them together in the green pastures, upon the river of rest, in the paradise of pleasure, from whence grief, sorrow, and sighing, shall flee away in the light of thy holy ones.”

“And to those, O Lord, whose souls thou hast received, grant rest therein, and vouchsafe to transfer them into the kingdom of the heavens. And preserve us who are still in this world, in thy faith, and lead us to thy heavenly kingdom; granting to us thy peace at all times, so that, together with Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost, thy most holy, glorious, and blessed name may be glorified, exalted, praised, blessed and hallowed, now and for ever.”

This is the whole, brethren, of the Alexandrian Liturgy, bearing the name of Basil, in which there is any reference to the saints, and to the departed. And I must beg of you to observe the following facts, in connexion with it.

First, you perceive, that there is not the slightest allusion to

the idea of a purgatory, nor the least intimation that the departed souls were suffering any pain, torment, or punishment whatever.

Secondly, you perceive, that although the first place among the saints seems clearly to be granted to the virgin Mary, by her title, the mother of God, yet there is no invocation nor address to her.

Thirdly, that although it is assumed that the virgin and the saints offer prayers and intercessions for the Church, yet none of them are *asked to pray for us*; instead of which, the Church *prays for them*, beseeching God to remember them; clearly proving, that even so late as the fifth century, the Church of Christ had not departed so far from the primitive purity as to offer public worship to the saints.

Fourthly, that the very same supplication which is offered for these most eminent saints, namely, that God would remember them, is likewise offered for the souls of *all the faithful departed*. Hence you perceive, that if simply praying for them proves that the Church supposed they were in purgatory, the virgin, and the apostles, and all the most eminent martyrs, must have been in purgatory too; which the Church of Rome would esteem, as well as ourselves, to be a most extravagant absurdity.

And fifthly, that the Church plainly held our doctrine on the state of the departed, that is to say, that they were in paradise with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, *that* paradise in which our Lord promised to be with the penitent thief in the day of his crucifixion, and in which he represented the soul of Lazarus to have been carried by the angels; a place of rest and pleasure, from which they looked forward to be transferred to the kingdom of heaven intended for their eternal habitation, after the resurrection of the body, at the final day. Fairly examined, therefore, nothing can more fully prove the novelty of the Roman Catholic doctrines, on the subject of saint-worship

and purgatory, than the language of this Liturgy, although it is not to be doubted, that the form in which it has come down to us is considerably different from that which it exhibited at an earlier period.

The most plausible argument, however, which the Church of Rome can present for her doctrine of purgatory, is that which urges the necessity of some intermediate place for those who are indeed Christian believers, but who, nevertheless, die in a state not pure nor holy enough for the kingdom of heaven, into which nothing undefiled can be allowed to enter. And hence they sometimes gain assent as to the probability of a certain measure of punishment, in order to complete that sanctification which was left imperfect in the present life. Now it may well be granted, that such an intermediate place for the departed soul is necessary; but it will by no means follow that purgatory, as they define it, is calculated for the purpose. So far from it, that I think a little reflection will show the very reverse of such a conclusion. For, according to the Scriptural account of the happy side of the region of departed spirits, it is a paradise, a place of rest and refreshment, inhabited by all the holy and the just who have ever lived upon the earth, visited by the angels, and even by Christ himself; while yet it is in sight of the regions of the lost, from which it is separated by an impassable gulf, across which, however, as the narrative of the rich man and Lazarus informs us, conversations may be held together. Suppose, then, the soul of a believer,—such an one as, according to the Roman Catholic system, must be consigned to the excruciating torments of purgatory, up to the very day of judgment,—suppose him to depart this life, and to be taken to this holy and blessed society; having indeed the true principle of faith, but yet far from that perfect holiness which is necessary for the judgment day, which, I ask, is the better place to improve and sanctify him? the purgatorial flames of excruciating anguish, or the peaceful paradise of the

spirits of the just? Surely it must be manifest, that the mere suffering of agony cannot teach, nor sanctify, nor exalt the thoughts and affections of the sinner. When the soul of the believer leaves the body, it has done with the temptations of the flesh, with the assaults of Satan, with the corrupt allurements of the world. Where can it increase its holiness, enlarge its divine knowledge, cherish the truth of God, adore his mercy in Christ, and thus become purified from all the stains and defilements of its earthly course, if not in the society of patriarchs, prophets and apostles, with the spectacle of the lost in view, the glory of heaven in prospect, and every motive and stimulus imaginable to help it forward, that it may be ready in the great day? While, on the other hand, all that we know of the effects of intense suffering is directly opposed to improvement. To *burn* the soul into goodness, to *scorch* it into wisdom, to *rack* it into knowledge, to *torture* it into the love of God,—who can listen to such a proposition without a mixture of wonder and indignation at the system, which talks of fire and flames as the means of spiritual sanctification? Most manifest then, it seems, to my mind, that the whole force of this most plausible argument of the Church of Rome, is directly hostile to their purgatorial theory; although it might well agree with the account which Scripture gives us of the place of departed spirits, in which the souls of the redeemed await the day of resurrection.

But we proceed, secondly, to the testimony of the fathers, in which we shall see, in the very evidence which is commonly adduced to sustain this invention, a clear proof that it was a novelty, unknown to the purer days of primitive Christianity.

Beginning with Irenæus, the bishop of Lyons, A. D. 170, we have a distinct corroboration of the true doctrine. “Since, therefore,” saith he, (Lib. v. Cont. Hær. cap. 31, p. 331,) “the Lord himself obeyed the law of death, that he might be

the first born from the dead, and remained until the third day in the lower parts of the earth, and afterwards arose in the flesh, so that he showed the very marks of the nails to his disciples, and thus ascended to his Father, how should they not be confounded that say that these lower regions are only this world, according to the present bodily state, but that the internal man, as soon as it leaves the body, ascends immediately to heaven? For even the Lord went into the midst of the shadow of death, where the souls of the dead were; and afterwards rose again in his body, and after his resurrection ascended up to heaven. And therefore it is manifest that the souls of his disciples, for whom the Lord did these things, will likewise depart into the invisible place, appropriated to them by the Deity, and will there remain until the resurrection; expecting the hour when they shall receive their bodies again, and rising in their perfect state, that is corporeally, as the Lord himself arose, will thus come to the vision of God." Here, brethren, we have a faithful statement of the doctrine of antiquity. Irenæus believed in no ascension to heaven for any saint, before the day of resurrection, and no purgatory nor punishment for the redeemed in the place of departed spirits; and therefore he did not agree, in either point, with the modern innovations of the Church of Rome.

Let us next hear Tertullian, in A. D. 200, on the same subject.

"Our lower regions," saith he, (*De Anima*, p. 303) speaking in reference to the notions of the heathen philosophers, "are not a naked cavity, nor yet a certain drain of the world under the waters; but they are a profound and vast space, in the inmost bowels of the earth. Therefore we read that Christ was in the heart of the earth, during the three days of his death, that is in the internal recess, enclosed within its lower abysses. But if Christ our God, because he was also man, being dead and buried according to the Scriptures, satisfied also this law,

according to the rule of human death, amongst these lower regions, and did not ascend to the highest heavens, until he had first descended to the lowest parts of the earth, in order that he might make the patriarchs and prophets his companions, you must needs believe that these regions are subterranean, and drive far from you those who proudly imagine that the souls of the faithful are not to enter these lower regions; thus placing the servants above their Lord, and the disciples above their Master, and despising the privilege of Abraham's bosom, where they might enjoy the consolation of looking forward to the resurrection.—For not yet has the trump of the archangel been heard, not yet has our Lord come to meet us in the air, along with those who shall first arise at his advent. Heaven is discovered to none as yet, the earth is still shut up; nor will the heavens be opened until the world passeth away.—Into these lower regions therefore," saith Tertullian in another place, "all souls are taken. And there are both punishments and pleasures, as you read in the parable of the rich man and the beggar." (P. 306.)

In this passage, brethren, we have another very clear proof of the ancient faith upon this interesting subject, perfectly inconsistent with the doctrine of purgatory, and the supposed assumption into heaven of the virgin and the saints. Elsewhere, indeed, Tertullian allows this distinction to the *martyrs*; but to all others he applies the rule you have heard, that the place of departed spirits must be the habitation of the soul, until the resurrection.

Next to Tertullian, we shall present the testimony of Origen, which the Church of Rome claims as being in her favour, but not by right. The passage is as follows: (Orig. in Jer. Hom. 1, p. 67,) "If any one shall preserve the baptism of the Holy Ghost, he communicates in the first resurrection. But if any one is kept until the second resurrection, he is a sinner, who needs the baptism of fire, and is purified by burn-

ing, that the fire may consume whatever he may have of the wood, hay and stubble. Wherefore, as we perceive that such may be our lot after death, let us be diligent in the knowledge of the Scriptures, and lay them up in our hearts, and strive to live according to their precepts; so that before the day of our departure, if possible, we may be cleansed from the filth of our sins, and be saved together with the saints in Christ Jesus."

In this passage, brethren, we have the earliest intimation of a purgatorial fire, namely, in A. D. 250, from a writer of great reputation for learning, genius and zeal, but yet reputed by the Church of Rome herself to be full of heretical notions. Whatever the soundness or unsoundness of his opinion might be, however, considered in itself, it will be sufficient on the present occasion to show you, that it has no accordance whatever with the modern form of the Roman doctrine. For, in the first place, we see that Origen's fiery purgation is expressly referred to the day of judgment, consequently, it could not be the purgatorial fire of the Roman Church, which is supposed to last until that day, and is then extinguished. In the second place, this fire of Origen's affects not only the soul, but the body also, being after the resurrection. But the Roman purgatory torments the soul alone. Thirdly, the prevention proposed by Origen is to lay up the knowledge of the Scriptures, and live according to their precepts, without one word of penance, mortification, voluntary sufferings, or indulgences. Whereas, the Church of Rome discourages the study of the Scriptures among the mass of her people, and teaches the benefit of penitential works, while living, and indulgences after death, as the only way to escape purgatory. And lastly, Origen contrasts the baptism of the Spirit with the baptism of fire; contemplating the application of this fire as a quick and powerful product of the judgment day. Whereas, the Church of Rome talks of the agonies of purgatory for hundreds and thou-

sands of years together, although never extending them beyond the day of judgment. Hence, although Origen speaks of fire, and of purgation after death, as does also the Church of Rome, yet in every particular, essential to the Roman doctrine, they are found to differ. Indeed, the doctrine of Origen would not be esteemed worth contending about on their part; nor, propounded merely as a matter of speculative interpretation, as was the fact in his case, should I think it deserved any serious discussion upon ours.

In the works of Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, there is nothing that looks in the least like the modern Roman doctrine; but on the other hand we find him declaring, in more than one place, that "no satisfaction can be rendered for sin, after the present life." (Cyp. De Lapsis. § 14. De El. et Bon. Op. § 2.) Whereas, it is the peculiar characteristic of the Roman Catholic system, that satisfaction can be made to the justice of God, so far as its temporal claims are concerned, as well after death as before, by masses, alms, prayers, and penances, performed by the Church on behalf of the departed, and especially by indulgences.

The numerous writings of the celebrated Jerome belong to a much later period of the Church, and yet even these do not furnish any sanction for the purgatorial doctrine. On the contrary, he lays down the principle, in his commentary on St. Matthew, (Tom. 4. p. 26) "that the soul will be punished, and will feel its sufferings, when it shall have received its former body, in order that the companion of its sin may also be the companion of its punishment." And on the famous text of St. Paul, which, in our last lecture we found Dr. Wiseman pressing into the service of purgatory, the explanation of Jerome is explicitly hostile to the Roman creed, (Tom. 4. p. 244) for he asserts the destruction of the wood, hay, and stubble, which any one may build upon the foundation of Christ, while he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire, to be the work of the

day of judgment; and thus excludes, by necessary implication, the whole purgatorial theory.

The language of Ambrose, the bishop of Milan, is equally irreconcilable with the Roman system. "Death," saith this eminent father, "is the separation of the soul and the body; but this dissolution is not evil, because to be dissolved and be with Christ is far better.—The Scripture calls death sleep, according to that passage: Our friend Lazarus sleepeth, I go that I may waken him. But sleep is good, because it is rest, as saith the Scripture, I laid me down and took my rest, I rose up, for the Lord sustained me. Sweet, therefore, is the sleep of death. But at length the Lord wakens those who are thus resting, because the Lord is the resurrection." (Tom. 1. p. 404.)

And again, this eminent father delivers the following animating exhortation. (Ib. 411.) "Let us fearlessly go to our Redeemer Jesus; fearlessly to the assembly of the patriarchs; fearlessly let us depart to our father Abraham, when the day approaches; fearlessly let us proceed to the congregation of the saints, to the convention of the righteous. For then we shall go to our fathers, we shall go to our instructors in the faith, and although our works may be deficient, faith will assist, that our inheritance may be preserved to us. We shall go where the holy Abraham opens his bosom, in order that he may receive the poor, even as he received Lazarus, in whose bosom they repose, who in this life endured calamity and sorrow." Here, brethren, we have another plain declaration of the Scriptural doctrine, without one word that even leans towards the modern creed of the Church of Rome.

We come now, however, to a witness on whose testimony they place great reliance, namely, the scholar of Ambrose, the distinguished Augustin, in some of whose very numerous works there are considerable approximations to their system, which are, nevertheless, more than neutralized, when we look at the

whole. I shall give you a specimen of both sorts of passages from this author.

“Some there are,” saith he, “who suffer temporal punishments in this life only, some after death, and some both now and then, but previous to that last and most severe judgment. But all who suffer temporal punishments after death, do not become subject to eternal punishment. For to some, what is not remitted in this life, *is remitted in the next*, in order that they may not be punished eternally.” (Aug. De Civ. Dei, Lib. 21, Cap. 13, p. 1432.) Now this looks very like the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and yet opposes it in two most important particulars. First, that Augustin speaks of *sin being remitted after death*, which they positively deny; for according to their system, the remission of the sin must take place in the present life, and the temporal pains of purgatory cannot be *remitted*, but must have *full payment*, either in the sufferings of the soul, or in an equivalent amount of the merits of Christ and the saints, placed to his credit by the Church, and especially by indulgences. The difference between them is precisely the same as there is between the *forgiving* a debt, and the *paying it*; so that the opinion of Augustin would now be heresy in the judgment of the Church of Rome. Secondly, Augustin does not say one word about this Roman doctrine of satisfaction, nor the treasure of the Church from which this satisfaction is made, nor of the pope's authority in making it: in all which respects he would be regarded as heretical as ourselves. But now let me proceed to show, by other passages, how Augustin expressed himself in reference to the opinion we have quoted; and we shall see most clearly that in his days, the doctrine now maintained was neither settled nor received by the Church.*

“It is not to be doubted,” saith he, “that the dead are aided

* See the whole of Augustin to Evodius, vol. II. p. 436.

by the prayers of the holy Church, by the salutary sacrifice, and by alms-deeds offered for their souls, that the Lord may deal with them more mercifully than their sins have deserved. For this custom delivered by the fathers, the whole Church observes; that for those who are deceased in the communion of the body and blood of Christ, when they are commemorated in their place at that sacrament, prayer is made, and the sacrament is also offered. It is therefore not to be disputed that these things are profitable to the deceased, but only to those who have so lived before death, that such services can profit them after death. For as to those who have departed this life without the faith which worketh by love, and its sacraments, these offices of piety are useless; since, while living, they received not the grace of God, or received it in vain, and thus laid up for themselves wrath instead of mercy. Hence, *no new merits are provided for the dead, when their pious friends perform any thing on their behalf*, but only the fruits consequent upon their own previous lives are rendered to them. For nothing is effected, unless they had lived so that these services might profit them when they should have departed. And thus no one can receive after death any thing but what he merited before death." (August. Op. Tom. V. p. 576, A.) †

Again, saith St. Augustin, "Those things which the Church celebrates in her commemoration of the dead, are not opposed to the apostle's declaration, where he saith, 'We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive according to the works done in the body, whether it be good or evil,' because every one prepares for himself this privilege, while he lives in the body, that such services may profit him. For they do not profit all; and wherefore do they not, unless it be on account of the difference of life which each has led in the body? When therefore sacrifices, either of the altar, or of certain alms-deeds, are offered for all who have died after baptism, these may be considered a returning

of thanks for the very good; for those who were not very wicked, they are propitiations; and for those who were very wicked, although they cannot help the dead, they may afford some comfort to the living. And to those who are benefited by them, the profit is either that they may have a *full remission*, or that their damnation may be rendered more tolerable." (Ib. Tom. VI. p. 95, 6.)

Now, in these passages we have Augustin plainly opposing the doctrine by which the Church of Rome imagines that she can free the soul from purgatory; for he expressly says that *no merits can be obtained for the deceased soul, but those of his own life while on earth*; whereas the entire operation of the Roman system consists in granting to the departed soul the *superfluous merits of Christ and the saints*, so as to form an *offset or satisfaction in the way of payment*, for the suffering due to his transgressions. Here again, it is impossible to protect Augustin from the charge of heresy, according to the modern doctrine of that Church, which yet would persuade us that she follows his authority.

Again, this eminent father, and favourite witness of the Roman Church, declares that "Whatever soul shall depart from the body, at whatever age, without the grace and the sacrament of the Redeemer, will be forthwith in punishment; and in the final judgment will receive the body again for eternal punishment. *But if, after the human generation which it has received from Adam, it is regenerated in Christ, and belongs to his society, it will enjoy rest after the death of the body, and will receive the body again for glory.* These doctrines concerning the soul," adds Augustin, "I hold most firmly." (Tom. II. p. 445, 13.) And well might he hold them firmly, brethren, because they are the doctrines of the Scriptures, and of all the fathers; while the other notions, respecting a purgatorial fire, were but the unsettled conjectures of a few.

Once more, let us hear the same distinguished father expressing his idea upon the doctrine of a purgatorial fire, and we shall see the contrast between the firm articles of his faith, and the doubtful conjectures of opinion.

“After the death of this body, truly,” saith he, (De Civit. Dei, Lib. 21, Cap. 26, p. 1456,) “until the final day of damnation and reward, after the resurrection, since the souls of the departed *are said* to suffer this sort of fire in that interval of time, which those do not feel who have not built the wood and hay and stubble of earthly works and affections (upon the true foundation) in this life; but which others feel who have carried with them this kind of building, whether this suffering is to be endured there only, or both here and there, or whether here, that it be not there, our worldly, although venial sins, find a burning fire of transitory tribulation, all this I do not censure, because, *perhaps*, it is true.” Mark this language, brethren, I beseech you, “the souls of the departed,” saith Augustin, “*are said* to suffer this sort of fire,” and “I do not censure,” continues he, “because *perhaps* it is true.” See how strongly he speaks of the Scriptural doctrine, which he declares that he *holds most firmly*, and then listen to him on the purgatorial notion, which he says he does not censure, because *perhaps it is true*, and tell me, brethren, whether any thing can more plainly show the commencement of this corruption, the perfect mistake of those who fancy it to have been the doctrine of the primitive creed, and the awful responsibility which the Church of Rome has incurred, by presuming to pronounce a curse on those who refuse to believe it.

From the testimony of Augustin I proceed to that of pope Leo the great, A. D. 452, which is of itself decisive upon the question.

“The manifold mercy of God,” saith this distinguished pontiff, “has so provided for human frailty, that not only by the

grace of baptism, but also by the medicine of penitence, the hope of eternal life may be restored.—But the guards of the divine goodness are so ordered, that the indulgence of God cannot be obtained unless through the supplications of his priesthood. For the mediator between God and man, Christ Jesus, gave this power to the rulers of the Church, that to those who confessed their sins, the act of penitence should be given, and that being purged by salutary satisfaction, they should be admitted through the door of reconciliation to the communion of the sacraments.”—“But if,” continues Leo, “there be any of those, for whom we supplicate the Lord, who is prevented by some obstacle, and falls away from the grace of this present indulgence, and before he can reach the constituted remedies, closes his temporal life according to the law of mortality, *that which he has not received in the body, he cannot receive when he has put off the body.* Nor is it necessary for us to discuss the merits or the actions of such as depart in this manner, since the Lord our God, whose judgments are incomprehensible, *will reserve to his own justice that which his priests have not fulfilled.*” Now here, brethren, Leo expressly declares, that the departed soul cannot receive after death the benefit which the use of the appointed remedies before death would have obtained for him. Yet he declares, and most truly, that the justice of God will supply the lack of the priesthood, and therefore such a soul would be precisely in the condition to which the modern doctrine of the Roman Church applies her purgatory, out of which purgatory he could at once be taken by a plenary indulgence. But Leo, the pope or bishop of Rome in A. D. 452, says not one word about either purgatory or indulgences for the departed soul; thus again proving, most clearly, that in his time, no such doctrines were fastened upon the Church, although some floating ideas had been put forth by a few individuals, which long afterwards were strained into an appearance of authority.

To this pope, I will add the testimony of another, namely, Gregory the great, in order to show the state of the purgatorial theory from A. D. 452 to A. D. 590. Describing the place of departed spirits, (Tom. I. 397. E.) he saith, "When we say that the souls of the just descend to the lower regions, or hell, we do not mean that they are detained in a place of punishment. But we believe that hell consists of two parts, the upper or superior, and the lower or inferior, and that the just enjoy their rest in the superior part, while the wicked are tormented in the inferior or lower portion. And thus we understand the Psalmist, where, by reason of the preventing grace of God, he saith: 'Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest hell.' Here we have a clear and consistent statement of this point, agreeing, in the main, with the older fathers.

I shall close these extracts from the fathers, brethren, by the candid though reluctant confession of the Benedictine editors of the works of Ambrose, (Tom. I. 385) in these words: "If it is not surprising that Ambrose should have written as he has done about the state of departed souls, it seems to be almost incredible how uncertain and various the holy fathers have been upon the same question, from the very times of the apostles to the pontificate of Gregory II. and the Council of Florence, that is, the period of almost fourteen hundred years. For not only does one father differ from another, as in questions not yet defined by the Church was likely to happen, but they are not even found to be consistent with themselves." Observe this acknowledgment, brethren, and see how it agrees with the marvellous doctrine of the Church of Rome, that all her traditions are apostolical, and that her creed has been the same from the beginning, that it is at this day.

But it is high time that we turn from these most uncandid pretensions, to the real foundations of purgatory, which are neither in the Scriptures nor in the fathers, but in the super-

stitious visions of the dark ages, cultivated diligently by the priesthood, so as to enlarge and fortify their power over the fears and terrors of mankind. And here I shall quote from the famous cardinal Bellarmine his account of the matter, which will show you, on the highest modern authority, the evidence as well as the position belonging to the doctrine. The extract must be long, brethren, but you will find it, I doubt not, more than usually interesting.

“Since many persons,” saith Bellarmine, “will not believe what they have never seen, it has pleased God sometimes to raise his servants from the dead, and to send them to announce to the living what they have really witnessed.” (Philpot’s *Letters to Butler*, p. 121, &c.) “A pious father of a family in Northumberland died, — but came to life again at the dawn of the following day. All but his faithful and affectionate wife fled at the sight of him, and to her he communicated the peculiar circumstances of his case, that he had indeed been dead, but was permitted to live again upon earth, though by no means in the same manner as before. In short, he sold all his property, divided the produce equally between his wife, his children, and the poor, and then retired to the monastery at Melrose. He there lived in such a state of unexampled mortification, as made it quite evident, even if he had not said a word upon the subject, that he had seen things—which no one else had been permitted to behold. He explained it all, however, in the following manner:—One, said he, whose aspect was as of light, and his garment glistening, conducted me to a valley of great depth and width, but of immeasurable length; one side of which was dreadful beyond expression for its burning heat, and the other as horrible for its no less intolerable cold. Both were filled with the souls of men, which seemed to be tost, as by the fury of a tempest, from one side to the other; for being quite unable to endure the heat on the right hand, the miserable wretches kept throwing themselves to the oppo-

site side into the equal torment of cold, and thence back again into the raging flames. This, thought I, must be hell; but my guide answered to my thought that it was not so. This valley, saith he, is the place of torment for the souls of those, who, after delaying to confess and expiate their sins, have at length, at the moment of death, had recourse to penance, and so have departed. These, at the day of judgment, will all be admitted into the kingdom of heaven, by reason of their confession and penance, late as it was. But, meanwhile, many of them may be assisted and liberated before that day, by the prayers, alms and fastings of the living, particularly by the sacrifice of the mass."

From this narrative, in which cardinal Bellarmine states his full belief, he proceeds to another of a higher claim, because it is the history of St. Christina, one of the saints placed in the dark ages upon the Roman calendar, where she is called a virgin and a martyr, and has a festival appointed in her honour on the 24th of July. The learned cardinal gives the relation in the words of St. Christina herself, (Philpot's Letters to Butler, p. 125) as follows:—

"Immediately upon my departure from the body," saith she, "my soul was received by ministers of light and angels of God, and conducted to a dark and horrid place filled with the souls of men. The torments which I there witnessed are so dreadful, that to attempt to describe them would be utterly in vain; and there I beheld not a few who had been known to me when they were alive. Greatly concerned for their hapless state, I asked what place it was, thinking it was hell; but I was told that it was purgatory, where are kept those who in their life-time had repented indeed of their sins, but had not paid the punishment due for them. I was next taken to see the torments of hell, where also I recognized some of my former acquaintances upon earth. Afterwards I was translated to paradise, even to the throne of the divine Majesty;

and when I saw the Lord congratulating me, I was beyond measure rejoiced, concluding, of course, that I should henceforward dwell with him for evermore. But he presently said to me, 'In very deed, my sweetest daughter, here you shall be with me; but for the present I offer you your choice. Will you stay for ever with me now? or will you return to the earth, and there, in your mortal body, but without any detriment to it, endure punishments, by which you may deliver out of purgatory all those souls whom you so much pitied, and may also, by the sight of your penance, and the example of your life, be a means of converting to me some who are yet alive in the body, and so come to me at last with a great increase of your merits?' I accepted, without hesitation, the return to life on the condition proposed; and the Lord, congratulating me on the promptitude of my obedience, ordered that my body should be restored to me. 'This is an account of my death and my return to life. I am recalled to life for the correction and improvement of men; I entreat you, therefore, not to be disturbed at what shall happen to me. I say this, because the things which you shall see wrought in me by the will of God, will far exceed human comprehension.'

These were her own words. The author of her biography adds his account of the manner in which her enterprise was conducted. She walked into burning ovens, and though she was so tortured by the flames that her anguish extorted from her the most horrible cries, yet when she came out, there was not a trace of any burning to be found upon her body. Again, during a hard frost, she would go and place herself under the frozen surface of a river, for six days and more, at a time. Sometimes she would be carried round by the wheel of a water-mill, with the water of the river, and after having been whirled round in a horrible manner, she was as whole in body as if nothing had happened to her—not a limb was hurt. At other times she would make all the dogs in the town fall upon

her, and would run before them like a hunted beast ; and yet, in spite of being torn by thorns and brambles, and worried and lacerated by the dogs to such a degree that no part of her body escaped without wounds, there was not a weal nor a scar to be seen. And this mode of life she endured for forty-two years, “during which time,” saith the historian, “she brought many sinners to repentance, and wrought many miracles after her death.”

There is yet a third example related by this celebrated Roman Catholic author, which he quotes from the *Life of St. Ludgardis*, written at the same period and by the same illustrious person who wrote the other. “About this time,” saith he, “Innocent III. after having held the Lateran Council, departed this life, and shortly afterwards appeared to St. Ludgardis. She, as soon as she beheld him encircled with a vast flame, demanded who he was, and on his answering that he was pope Innocent, she exclaimed with a groan, ‘What can this be? How is it that the common father of us all is thus tormented?’ ‘The reasons of my suffering thus,’ he answered, ‘are three in number, and they would have consigned me to eternal punishments, had I not, through the intercession of the most pious mother of God, to whom I founded a monastery, repented in my last hour. As it is, though I am spared from eternal suffering, yet I shall be tortured in the most horrible manner to the day of judgment ; and that I am now permitted to come and pray for your suffrages, is a favour which the mother of mercy has obtained for me from her Son.’ With these words he disappeared. Ludgardis not only communicated to her holy sisters the sad necessity to which the pope was reduced in order to obtain their succour, but she also submitted to astonishing torments on his account.”

Here then, brethren, we have the real mode of sustaining the Roman doctrine of purgatory, not by Scripture, nor yet by the records of the primitive Church, which are speciously, indeed,

but most unwarrantably appealed to for the purpose, but by the influence of marvellous, horrible and absurd stories, gotten up in the dark ages, and greedily swallowed by the people, at a period when the popular credulity was sufficient for any thing. For these were the ages of the wildest romance, when all imaginable and monstrous tales of enchanters, giants, wizards, genii, and fairies, together with the daring extravagances of knight-errantry, were in full vogue; when the middling and lower classes of society were slaves to their lords, and when the higher orders divided their lives between war, love, and superstition.

The doctrine of indulgences took its regular form at the same time, and was an important part of the system, which extended the power of the priesthood over the unseen world, and promised its most certain and wonderful effects in that spiritual state from whence no counter-evidence could be brought to contradict them. Their first appearance in history was on the occasion of the crusades in the eleventh century; when the popes, for the encouragement of warriors to undertake the recovery of the holy land, proclaimed remission of all their sins to the soldiers of the cross. The great Council of Lateran, in the 13th century, applied them to the warriors who engaged to extirpate heresy by fire and sword; and after some time they became so extended, that very trifling sums of money, or personal services, were sufficient to obtain them. It was this which, under God, led to the Reformation. For Leo X. being desirous of raising a large sum of money in order to complete the magnificent Church of St. Peter at Rome, followed the advice of one of his cardinals; and, as a Roman Catholic historian expresses it, “spread throughout the world the amplest indulgences, not only for the benefit of the living, but also with power to loose the souls of the dead from purgatory; which things, having in themselves neither probability nor authority, it being notorious that they were granted solely to

extort money from those who had more simplicity than prudence, and being besides, exercised most imprudently by the commissioners, the greatest part of whom purchased from the court the power of exercising them, had excited in many places great indignation and scandal, especially in Germany, where faculties for liberating the souls of the dead from purgatory were sold at a trifling price, or made the stakes of gambling in taverns." (Philpot's Letters to Butler, 182 to 185.) This extract, brethren, which is in the words of their own writer, fully justifies the indignant zeal of Luther, when he publicly attacked these indulgences at Wittemberg: and thus was the excess of this modern corruption made the instrument of restoring the true doctrines of the Gospel, and bringing back the long neglected system of the Word of God.

Since the Reformation, an immense reduction has certainly been practically and theoretically effected in this matter. The assumed infallibility of the Church of Rome, however, prevents an open avowal of the improvement; and indeed the substantial errors of these three connected corruptions, satisfaction, purgatory and indulgences, are still maintained, although to a very different degree of extravagance, both in the papal dominions, and in countries where the Reformation has been successful. To show the existing state of the matter in our own day, the best evidence I can set before you is the bull of the pope, published in A. D. 1825, for the last jubilee.

"During this year," saith the pope, "which we truly call the acceptable time and the time of salvation, &c., we have resolved, in virtue of the authority given to us by heaven, fully to unlock that sacred treasure, composed of the merits, sufferings and virtues of Christ our Lord, and of his virgin mother, and of all the saints, which the Author of human salvation has entrusted to our dispensation. We proclaim that the year of atonement and pardon, of redemption and grace, of remission and indulgence, is arrived; in which we know that those bene-

fits which the old law, the messenger of things to come, brought every fiftieth year to the Jewish people, are renewed in a much more sacred manner by the accumulation of spiritual blessings, through Him, by whom came peace and truth. During which year of the Jubilee, we mercifully give and grant in the Lord, a plenary indulgence, remission and pardon of all their sins, to all the faithful of Christ, truly penitent and confessing their sins and receiving the holy communion, who shall visit the Churches of blessed Peter and Paul, &c., and shall pour forth their pious prayers to God for the exaltation of the Church, the extirpation of heresies, the concord of Catholic princes, and the safety and tranquillity of Christian people."

"But you, venerable brethren," continues the pope, in another part of the same instrument, "patriarchs, primates, archbishops, bishops, co-operate with these our cares and desires. To you it belongs to explain with perspicuity the power of indulgences; what is their efficacy, not only in the remission of canonical penance, but also of the temporal punishment due to divine justice for sin; and what succour is afforded out of this heavenly treasure, from the merits of Christ and his saints, to such as have departed real penitents in God's love, yet before they had duly satisfied, by fruits worthy of penance, for sins of commission and omission, and are now purifying in the fire of purgatory, that an entrance may be opened for them into their eternal country, where nothing defiled is admitted. Courage and attention, venerable brethren, for some there are, following that wisdom which is not from God, and covering themselves under sheep's clothing—who, under the usual pretence of a more refined piety, are now sowing amongst the people erroneous comments on this subject." (Philpot's *Let. to But. Sup.* p. 428.)

We see here, brethren, that the theory of this matter is stated in strong and plain terms under the very authority of the pope himself, while, with regard to the practice, the book

called True Piety, prepared expressly for the Roman Catholics of this country, informs us, that a plenary indulgence may be obtained in the United States on the following days: "1. From Christmas Eve to Epiphany. 2. From the first Sunday in Lent to the second inclusive. 3. From Palm Sunday to Low Sunday inclusively, except Good Friday and Holy Saturday. 4. From Whitsunday to the end of the Octave of Corpus Christi. 5. On the five great festivals of the blessed virgin Mary, with their Octaves. 6. On the festivals of St. Peter and St. Paul, of St. Michael the archangel, and within their Octaves." (True Piety, New York ed. of 1826, p. 226.) From which it appears, that the American Roman Catholic can have a plenary indulgence, either for himself or for the souls in purgatory, on nearly half the days in the year. The fee paid for them I have no means of ascertaining, but I am well assured that they cannot be had without money and without price, however poor the man, and however pressing the supposed necessity.

And now, brethren, although I have wearied myself and you with this long discussion, I feel that it would be due to the occasion to speak of the result of these perversions, if a better opportunity were not at hand on the closing of the series. I shall only therefore, add, that our next and last subject will be the doctrine of the eucharistic sacrament, including transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass. The labour necessary in the preparation of these discourses, on my part, and the close attention demanded on yours, will not be without fruit, if they aid in strengthening our gratitude to God for the light of that Reformation, which has freed us from the yoke of this spiritual bondage. O! that the millions of our fellow Christians, who are still lying under it, might learn to know their error, and return to the Scriptural truth of that Gospel which alone can make them free. The Church of Rome was once the first among the Churches. St. Paul himself bore

testimony, that their faith was spoken of throughout the whole world. God grant that it may yet be brought back to the same pure and apostolic standard, when every invention of men, every trace of superstition, every relic of a dark and barbarous age, every perilous dependence upon the exercise of priestly power in the unseen world, which God has made subject neither to our observation nor to our control,—when all, in a word, which has defiled and deformed the religion of the glorious Redeemer, shall be swept away from the Universal Church; when the faith that was *once Catholic* shall be Catholic again, and the blessed Word of God shall go forth to the ends of the earth, conquering and to conquer.

LECTURE XV.

1 COR. xi. 29.—For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord.—(Doway Version.)

THE topic on which we are about to enter, my brethren, is one of the most important points in our controversy with the Church of Rome, and has given rise to more subtle disputation than almost any other, amongst Protestants themselves. It is the question of the presence of Christ in the administration of the holy Eucharist, commonly called the Lord's Supper. There are four or five varieties of opinion upon this subject, amongst orthodox Christians, of which, however, it does not fall within our proposed range to treat particularly; our design being chiefly to set forth the error which our own branch of the Reformation has condemned in the Thirty-nine Articles, under the well-known name of *Transubstantiation*.

This doctrine may be briefly stated as follows: The Church of Rome holds, that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Table, or of the Altar, there is a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice of the actual flesh and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, under the appearance of bread and wine; and that by virtue of the priestly prayer of consecration, the elements are so changed, that nothing remains of their former substance but only the outward appearance, which they call the *species*; the whole of the bread being transmuted into the actual flesh, and the whole of the wine into the actual

blood of Christ, and each believer receiving, from the hand of the priest, the entire body, blood, soul, and divinity of the Saviour. They further contend, that the whole of Christ is contained in either form, so that it is not necessary to partake of both the bread and the wine as Christ himself appointed. And hence, for many centuries, they allow the laity only to receive the bread or wafer, and confine the use of the wine to the priests alone. This latter change in the administration of the sacrament they call a matter of discipline, and acknowledge that there is no authority for it in Scripture or the fathers, but justify it, as they suppose, by the argument, that as there can be no human body without blood, therefore, in receiving the body of Christ, they necessarily receive the blood also. The main doctrine of Transubstantiation they defend from the positive words of our Lord, "*Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you.*"—"Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins," (Matt. xxvi. 26,) as also from the declaration of the Redeemer in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, "*Unless you eat of the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day.*"

In contradistinction from the Roman doctrine, amongst others, is that which our Church maintains, together with the Church of England, from which we derived it. And here our Articles teach, that there is indeed a partaking of the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament of the holy Eucharist, *when received with a lively faith*. But that this presence of Christ is *after a heavenly and spiritual manner*, and not according to the earthly notion of a gross material substance: that therefore, there is no change of the substance of the bread and of the wine, but only a solemn consecration of them to a sacred use, which does truly change

their character and their name, but not their material nature. And hence our Articles condemn the Roman Catholic tenet of Transubstantiation, declaring that "*it cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given rise to many superstitions.*"

We further deny that in the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist there is a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice of Christ. For Christ hath *once suffered for sin*, saith the Apostle, and there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, but only a commemoration of that which is made already. The only sacrifice we acknowledge, therefore, is the sacrifice of praise, the offering to God the sacred elements, as we do all our other worship, and the holy, reasonable, and living sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be his forever.

In examining the argument belonging to our subject, we have to inquire, 1st, What say the Scriptures? 2dly, What say the fathers? and 3dly, What is the history and present state of the Roman doctrine.

First then, the Church of Rome insists that Scripture, in its literal sense, is decisive in her favour. *This is my body*, saith Christ: *This is my blood*. But to this we reply, that the *literal* meaning of Scripture is not always the *true one*. It is, indeed, the sound and acknowledged rule of interpretation, that the literal sense is to be received, unless it involves an absurdity or a contradiction. And we allege that the language of our Lord must be understood *figuratively*, and not *literally*, by virtue of this very rule; since it is one of the instances to which the saying of the Apostle applies: *The letter killeth, it is the Spirit that giveth life*.

I shall endeavour to justify this allegation, by referring to those texts of Scripture, in which a similar use of metaphorical or figurative terms is acknowledged on all hands; and shall then prove, as it seems to me, that the essential

principles of all religious evidence oblige us to construe the words relied on in the same manner.

Our blessed Lord saith, for instance, *I am the door, I am the vine, I am the way.* Thus also, the apostle saith, *The rock was Christ:* all of which, with a multitude of others, are admitted to be figurative expressions, although full of truth and meaning. But we cannot prove them to be figurative by any other mode, than by showing the incongruity or absurdity of their literal signification. And this cannot be shown by doubting, whether the omnipotence of Christ could assume the appearance of these various forms; for how can we place limits to the Almighty? It does not become us to define what shall be impossible with God. For aught we know, Christ could have taken the aspect of a vine, or a way, or a rock, if it had pleased him. But such a transformation could have answered no purpose that we can conceive; neither is it mentioned in the sacred history as having been either intended, or as having taken place; and hence it is agreed, with perfect unanimity, that these expressions were figurative, designed for a spiritual and not a literal interpretation. I am aware, indeed, that our Roman brethren are shocked at such an argument, and think that it is characterized by gross irreverence. But they must permit me to retort the charge upon themselves. For if it be irreverent to imagine that the divine Redeemer should appear in the form of a vine or a rock, how much more irreverent must it be to teach, that he presents himself in the shape of a wafer?

With perfect consistency, therefore, as we maintain, we apply the same reasoning to the subject of the Eucharist. Our Lord had previously declared in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, *I am the living bread that came down from heaven, if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever. And the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. He that eateth my flesh, and*

drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. Now in these expressions, the literal sense was totally repugnant, because it would contemplate the most revolting act of cannibalism, in the very face of the Mosaic law. And therefore, as it is manifest that our Lord could not have designed the *literal* eating and drinking of his flesh and blood, the *figurative* and *spiritual* sense was necessarily the only one to be adopted. His whole meaning indeed was not yet clear, even to his apostles. The careless and unbelieving crowd turned away at what they called a hard saying. It was their duty to have waited in humility, and asked for an explanation. Instead of which, they condemned him at once; and probably concluding that there was some ground for the slander of his enemies, that *he had a devil and was mad*, walked no more with him. The apostles had faith enough, however, to know, that all their divine Master's words must be susceptible of a wise and consistent meaning, and therefore they patiently received his declaration, and waited until they should have it fully explained. Accordingly, in the night in which he was betrayed, he tells them the mystery of his sacrifice for the sins of the world; he shows them that *union with him* was the appointed way of salvation; that as the common bread of life nourished the body by becoming incorporated with it, so he would be the bread of life both to the body and the soul. And then he institutes this affecting sacrament, breaking the bread, and saying, *Take, eat: this is my body which is given for you;* and delivering to them the cup, saying, *Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many, for the remission of sins.* How beautifully the mystery of redeeming love is here both figuratively and spiritually set before them! that in the faithful reception of those consecrated emblems, Christ would unite himself with them so perfectly, that his

body should be accounted one with their body, his blood with their blood, his soul with their soul, that the atonement of his blessed sacrifice and the obedience of his perfect righteousness should thus be secured to them, and the power of his Divinity should be pledged on their behalf, to cleanse, and sanctify, and make them more and more fit for his eternal society in heaven!

Here then, the apostles had the former mysterious declaration explained. The bread of heaven, which is spiritual, was represented by the bread of earth, which is natural, in order to show how the Redeemer's love could unite the earthly offspring of the first Adam, to that second Adam who was the Lord from heaven. And although the symbols of this precious mystery were fitly appointed to commemorate the body that was broken and the blood that was shed, because his obedience unto death was the meritorious ground of our redemption, yet the blessing promised, and designed to be bestowed, was the incorporation not literally with his *natural* but with his *spiritual* body, the Bread from heaven, in order that his elect might form that mystical body which is the blessed company of all faithful people—that body of which he is the Head and the Spouse, the New Jerusalem—the Church of God.

To my mind, any other construction than this would involve us in the very absurdity, which the Roman Catholic expositors acknowledge must be avoided in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, where the Jews are said to have murmured, asking, *How can this man give us his flesh to eat.* For they all connect that chapter with the institution of the Eucharist, and, to a certain extent, we have no objection to this interpretation. They also acknowledge that the literal eating of our Saviour's body and blood, according to the mistaken notion of those disciples who turned back and walked no more with him, would have been a horrible and atrocious wickedness. And yet they imagine that the bread and the wine are transubstantiated in the sacrament so per-

fectly, as to be *corporeally and literally, the very same flesh and blood which were sacrificed upon the cross*, the difference being in the *outward appearance merely*. But is not this a manifest trifling with their own rule of interpretation? Is it not rejecting the literal sense in one place, while they contend for it in the other place, although in both, our Lord is speaking of the very same thing? Is it not further liable to the fatal objection, that the right and the wrong—the propriety or the abomination of a literal eating and drinking human flesh and blood,—is made to turn, *not upon the substantial reality*, but on the *mere outward disguise*? So that while they acknowledge it would be atrocious to eat our Lord's flesh, *if it looked like flesh*, the sin becomes piety, when it is his flesh *under the outward appearance of bread*! Surely, however, it must be manifest, that the *outward appearance cannot change the quality of the act*, when the doer of the act professes to know that it is *only an outward appearance*; and therefore they are involved in the strange absurdity of asserting, that the eating and drinking human flesh and blood, which is confessed to be an atrocious barbarity in one chapter, becomes an act of the highest religion in the other.

Out of this difficulty I can see no way of escape. For if they allege that our Saviour's body and blood were in the one case *natural*, whereas in the case of the Eucharist they are produced by *miracle*, it will be plain that it is no answer, for two reasons. First, because our Saviour's *natural body and blood* were as perfectly the product of a *MIRACLE* as his sacramental body and blood can be; and secondly, because it is their own doctrine that *THEY ARE THE SAME*. Listen to the prayer at the Mass, directed to be offered by the people, when the *Host* is lifted up; that is, the consecrated bread of the sacrament, which they call the Host, from the Latin word *hostia*, signifying the victim, or the sacrifice. The bell is rung to give notice to the congrega-

tion, the priest lifts up the consecrated wafer or Host on high, all the people fall on their knees, and this is the prayer addressed to it:

“Hail, O victim of salvation! eternal King! incarnate Word! sacrificed for me and all mankind. Hail! precious body of the Son of God. Hail! sacred flesh, torn with nails, pierced with a lance, and bleeding on the cross for us poor sinners.” (True Piety, p. 61.)

In like manner, at the elevation of the chalice with the consecrated wine, there is a similar address to it.

“Hail, sacred blood! flowing from the wounds of Christ, and washing away the sins of the world. O cleanse, sanctify and preserve my soul.” (Ib. 62.)

Thus, too, in one of the acts directed before communion, (True Piety, p. 122,) the communicant uses these words: “Yes, my dear Saviour, I openly confess, and am inwardly convinced, that it is thou thyself I am going to receive; thou who for my sake wast born in a manger; thou who for my redemption didst die on a cross, and who, though now gloriously seated on thy heavenly throne, still *continuest on earth, under the sacramental veils*, to feed and nourish the souls of men. Were I to behold thee with my corporeal eyes, and examine the impressions of the wounds thou didst receive in thy sacred hands and side, as St. Thomas did, still I could not say with more confidence than I do now, that thou art my Lord and my God. Though my senses may tell me it is nothing but mere bread, yet submitting them entirely in obedience to divine faith, I answer, *it is thy real body and blood, accompanied by thy soul and divinity.*” Here, brethren, it is perfectly plain, that the sacramental body and the natural body are regarded as precisely *identical in substance and reality*; and therefore the eating and drinking must be substantially and really the same act in the one case, that it would be in the other. Consequently the neces-

sity for abandoning the literal sense, for the figurative and spiritual, must be the same in both.

This brings me to the second argument, namely, that the doctrine of the Church of Rome obliges us to contradict the evidence of the senses, in a matter which is the proper object of sense; and thus to cast aside the highest testimony which God himself has committed to his creatures. True, indeed, they try to evade this argument by telling us, that it is as contrary to reason that God should be Three and One, as it is contrary to sense that flesh should exist with the appearance of bread, and blood with the appearance of wine. But this appears to me to be a mere sophism. In receiving the doctrine of the Word of God concerning the Trinity, we are not called upon to contradict our reason. The calumny sometimes heard against the Trinity, that the proposition is contradictory, arises from the ignorance of the objector. For we do not hold that God is Three, in the *same respect* as he is One, but that he is THREE in *personality*, and ONE in *essence* or in *substance*, which, however it may be *above* our reason, can never be justly said to be *contradictory* to it. Indeed, so far is religion from demanding a contradiction either to sense or reason, that all its evidences appeal directly to the senses, and through them to the reason. When our Saviour performed his wonderful works, he addressed himself to the senses, in proof of his doctrine. When he changed the water into wine, how did his disciples know the fact? *By their senses.* When he fed the thousands with a few loaves and fishes; when he walked on the water; when he raised Lazarus from the dead; when he healed the deaf, the blind, the halt and the maimed; when he cast out devils, and said to the raging billows, "*Peace, be still;*" how did the apostles know what was done? *By their senses.* When he bowed his sacred head upon the cross, arose from the dead, and ascended into heaven, how did they learn these truths? *By the senses.* And therefore we see that **THE WHOLE**

HISTORY OF THE GOSPEL, the divinity, the humanity, the miracles, and the sacrifice of our Lord, derived their testimony from sense, and from sense alone.

Perfectly regardless of all this, the doctors of Rome tell us, when arguing about their dogma of transubstantiation, that we must not trust our senses to inform us whether a certain substance is bread or flesh, and whether a certain other substance is wine or blood. *Christ said so*, they exclaim, and therefore it must be true. The question, however, is not, what did our blessed Lord say, but how are we to understand him? For his words admit of two interpretations; one of which is consistent with the senses and reason, while the other grossly contradicts them both. The Church of Rome insists that we shall take the contradictory interpretation, because it suits best, as they think, with the words of the Gospel. But how do we know the words are in the Gospel? *By our senses*. Our eyes testify that the language is recorded. And how do we know that the substance of the bread and of the wine remain unchanged by the prayer of consecration? *By our senses*. The same eyes that bear the one testimony, bear also the other. The Church of Rome, therefore, places herself in this dilemma, that the same eyes which she commands us to believe one moment, she requires us to disbelieve the next. Neither is this the whole extent of the absurdity. For we have only the sense of sight to satisfy us that the words are in the Bible, but we have the sight, the smell, the taste, and the touch, all testifying that the bread is not flesh, and that the wine is not blood. And yet the Church of Rome commands us, *under pain of damnation*, TO DISBELIEVE THE WHOLE FOUR SENSES, in order to comply with her claim of infallibility. Truly, my brethren, it is hard to know which we should most admire in such a doctrine, the boldness which demands the acquiescence of mankind under the penalty of a curse, or

the infatuation which has bowed the intellect of millions to such a monstrous proposition.

Now these arguments we think amply sufficient to show, that when our Lord uttered the words: "This is my body which is broken for you, this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for you," he designed not to establish transubstantiation, but to set forth figuratively and spiritually the great truth on which rests the whole application of the Gospel system, namely, that his sincere and faithful people must be *incorporated with him* in body and soul, in order to their redemption; and therefore that in this blessed sacrament he would give himself to them, and unite himself to them, mystically and spiritually, though really, for that gracious and glorious purpose: while, in the bread and wine, appointed as the outward symbols of this spiritual mystery, he designed to exhibit, not his *actual* flesh and blood, but an expressive *figure* or *emblem* of them. For otherwise, in adopting the literal sense, so as to imagine a total change of the substance of the bread into Christ's natural flesh, and the substance of the wine into his natural blood, we contradict the divine system given to the Israelites, to which the notion of feeding upon human flesh and blood would have been utterly abhorrent; we contradict the evidence of the senses in the proportion of four out of five; we contradict the order of faith, since faith cometh *by hearing*, that is, by *the sense*, which is the only avenue to the mind. And this complicated contradiction of Scripture, sense, and reason, is to *serve no end*; because the incorporation of the faithful with Christ, both in body and soul, and his presence in the sacrament for that purpose, is provided for as perfectly by our doctrine as by theirs, and in a manner which we think much more suitable to the character of the Christian system. For this view of the subject presents a true analogy with the other great sacrament of Baptism. "*Except a man be born of water and the Spirit,*" saith our Lord, "*he cannot enter*

into the kingdom of God." Here the connecting the outward symbol of water which cleanses the body, with the inward grace of the Holy Spirit which cleanses the soul, demands no change in the natural properties of the water. The minister prays that God would sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin, and refers to the piercing of the Saviour's side on the cross, and the water flowing from it. But the consecrating of the portion applied in the performance of this solemn ordinance, involves no transubstantiation of it into the very water which issued from the sacred body of Christ, although the express command of our Redeemer makes the water indispensable to the sacrament. So in the other case, precisely. The same blessed Redeemer connects the outward symbols of bread and wine with the inward grace, which incorporates him mystically, though most truly, with his faithful people, thus rendering them one with his spiritual body. "*For there is a natural body,*" saith St. Paul, "*and there is a spiritual body. As it is written, the first Adam was made a living soul, the second Adam was made a quickening Spirit.*" And our Lord himself declared to the objectors against his doctrine: "IT IS THE SPIRIT THAT QUICKENETH, THE FLESH PROFITETH NOTHING." But the transubstantiating the outward emblems of bread and wine would avail no more to our union with this spiritual body, than the transubstantiating of the water in baptism would avail to our spiritual birth-right. They are both expressive *figures* or *emblems* of the spiritual benefit, conveyed in the faithful use of the sacraments. The water cleanses the body by washing away impurity. So doth the Spirit of Christ cleanse the soul by washing away our sin. Bread and wine continue and support our bodily life, by entering into and becoming a part of our carnal substance. So doth the Spiritual Body of Christ continue and support our spiritual life, by entering into and becoming incorporated with all the affections,

faculties and powers of the soul. The real force and beauty of this divine arrangement is not improved but marred by the idea of transubstantiation, and neither the proper definition nor the design of a sacrament will apply to it any longer.

As the testimony of the fathers, which belongs to every point in the Roman Catholic controversy, is reserved for our next and last lecture, I shall occupy the brief remnant of this discourse by a condensed statement of the rise and progress of the doctrine.

The unhappy tendency to degenerate, which has always, since the fall, been characteristic of mankind, was stimulated by the peculiar circumstances of the Church in the dark ages of Europe, and by the subtlety of her spiritual foe, until it produced an immense variety of superstitions. Thus the Bible was used to determine future conduct and events, by opening it, after prayer, and drawing an augury from the first verse on which the eye might fasten. The water of Baptism was applied as a charm; the bread and wine of the Eucharist were mixed with poultices,* to increase their efficacy; the sign of the cross was supposed to put demons to flight, and by degrees an imaginary power and constantly increasing exaltation of dignity were connected with the martyrs, with the saints, with pieces of the true cross, with relics, pictures, images, holy water, and, in a word, with every thing belonging to the ceremonials of religion, which were increased inordinately from time to time. I am far from attributing all this to any deliberate intention of the priesthood to impose upon the people; so far, indeed, that I do not design to cast the slightest shade upon the sincerity of the main body of the priests themselves. It was the taste and temper of the countries and the times, imbibed by all men from their early education in the days of heathen-

* See Bishop Burnet's *Expos. of Thirty-nine Art.* p. 340.

ism, following them into their profession of Christianity, and insensibly debasing and corrupting the whole system, from the period when the Church began to practice on the dangerous principle of expediency, without asking for any warrant from the Word of God.

It is obvious that while such a process was going on in every other quarter, the highest sacrament of the Gospel would feel its influence most sensibly, so that the true doctrine of Christ's spiritual presence in the holy Eucharist, would readily suggest a superstitious veneration of the elements themselves, until, at length, the corporal presence of Christ in these elements was made a point of faith, and they were even commanded to be adored with the highest worship.

It took many centuries, however, to establish the whole of this corruption. The first author who openly taught the corporal presence, was Paschase Radbert, Abbot of Corby, in France, in the 9th century. And he was opposed by almost all the distinguished men of his time. The dispute subsided, and little was said about it during the 10th century, which is usually looked upon as the darkest and the worst in ecclesiastical history. But about the middle of the 11th century it was again revived, with a strong increase of favour on the side of superstition. The famous Berengarius arose at this time, and wrote against it. He was answered by Lanfranc and others, and many councils were held upon the point. But at length Berengarius was condemned, and as by this time it had become the law throughout Europe that heretics should be burned alive, the fear of this co-operated with the general appetite for the marvellous, and the new doctrine rapidly gained ground until it was thoroughly confirmed.

Honorius IV. was the first pope who ordered the elements to be adored. Gregory IX. afterwards directed that a bell should be rung to give the people notice of the elevation. The Schoolmen next took up the doctrine, and

refined it into its present shape by the aid of the Aristotelian philosophy, which was then the great system of metaphysics, to which every thing was submitted, as to a touchstone. The term transubstantiation was applied to it by the 4th Council of Lateran, and the body of Amalric, who had written against it some years before, was taken up and burned; for such was now the horror with which the Church regarded heresy, that the very bones of a heretic could not be suffered to moulder quietly in their grave.

The next memorable event in the history of the doctrine, was the establishment of the great festival of *Corpus Christi*, which is related in the following manner. A certain nun of Liege, named *Juliana*, in the year 1230, had a vision of the full moon, which seemed to have a gap in its circumference; and was told by a special revelation from heaven, that the moon signified the Church, and the gap signified the want of a certain festival in honour of the body of Christ, which she was to commence and announce to the world. Some remarkable miracles occurred about the same time, to help forward the doctrine. They relate, for example, that while a certain priest, who did not believe in transubstantiation, was going through the ceremonies of the Mass, *drops of blood fell upon his surplice*, and when he endeavoured to conceal them in the folds of his garment, *they formed bloody images of the consecrated wafer all over it*. In another quarter it was reported, that certain unbelieving Jews carried away the Host, (that is, the consecrated wafer or bread of the sacrament,) and beginning to pound it in a mortar, found, to their dismay, that *blood issued from it*, and that *the blows seemed to be upon flesh*. And again, we are told, by the same Baronius (Tom. 13, p. 579.) that some thieves, having robbed a Church, threw away the Host into a pool, where it kept the water from freezing all the next winter; and a neighbouring deacon, who did not know what the reason could be until after the

thieves had confessed their crime, observed a constant shining light hovering over the spot every night. This miracle was forthwith published, greatly to the credit of the new doctrine, and the wonderful Host was carried in solemn procession to the principal Church. Soon afterwards, pope Urban IV. decreed the festival called *Corpus Christi*, in which the same procession is still kept up every year, with the utmost magnificence, in Roman Catholic countries; every one being compelled to kneel down as the sacred Host passes by; and lights, and incense, and music, and beautiful children dressed as angels, with banners, flags, and every other splendid appendage, render it the most imposing spectacle among their ceremonies.

The last finish was given to this subject at a still later period. For the apprehension of spilling or wasting the smallest portion of the consecrated wine, which they supposed to be the actual blood of Christ, became so great, that they began to draw it into the mouth with quills and pipes; and at last the Council of Constance,* in A. D. 1415, took the cup from the laity altogether; thus assuming to be wiser than Christ, and making it exceedingly doubtful, to say the least, whether the laity receive the sacrament at all. For after they have wantonly taken away one half of this divine institution, how do they know that the other half will profit them?

But thanks be to God, my brethren, that our lot has been cast in an age and a country, where we are relieved from the yoke of this comparatively novel superstition; and where the Church of Rome herself does not attempt to celebrate those public processions, which, in other quarters, remind the traveller so strongly of the compulsory genius of her system. Thanks be to God, for the return of that pure

* Hard. Con. Tom. 8. p. 381. The decree acknowledges that Christ Jesus ordained, and that the primitive Church administered in both kinds, and yet orders those to be *punished as heretics*, who hold the change to be unlawful!

and primitive faith, which places the sacraments before us as our Lord himself appointed—which holds forth every profound and affecting principle of our divine Saviour's doctrine, without a superstitious exaltation of the outward emblem,—without a perilous worshipping of consecrated bread, under the notion that it is transformed into a present Deity. Let us never forget, however, that there is a presence of Christ Jesus granted to every *faithful receiver* of that blessed sacrament; since to all such, our Lord, with the consecrated symbols, does truly give the inestimable benefit of his body and blood, not after a corporeal, but after a spiritual and heavenly manner, to be the support, and nourishment, and strength of their souls. And while we fervently seek, by confession and penitence before the Searcher of hearts, by a lively exercise of faith and pious thankfulness, and by the grace of charity, manifesting itself in every good word and work, to prepare ourselves, through the power of the Holy Spirit, for the due reception of the sacrament, let us also pray, with zealous earnestness, for the welfare of the Holy Catholic Church, whether they be Greeks, Romans, or any other branch of our Christian brethren; that every superstitious invention of man may be banished from among them, that every change brought in upon the Gospel of Christ, may be done away, and that the whole world may be united in the pure worship of Him who can alone make us wise unto salvation.

LECTURE XVI.

1 Cor. ii. 29. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord. (Doway Version.)

SUCH of you, my brethren, as I had the pleasure of addressing at the delivery of our last lecture, will remember that we treated the doctrine of Transubstantiation as held by the Church of Rome; that is to say, the change which they believe takes place in the bread and wine of the holy Eucharist, by which, immediately upon the priest's pronouncing the words of consecration, the bread becomes transubstantiated into the actual flesh of our blessed Redeemer, and the wine into his actual blood—the self-same flesh and blood which he sacrificed upon the cross, and along with them, his soul and his Divinity; so that they hold it to be an act of faith to fall on their knees before the bread and wine, thus consecrated, and as they suppose, converted into the Saviour himself; and adore them under this belief, as if the Lord Jesus Christ was presented to them, in the outward form of bread and wine. We explained on the other hand, the doctrine of our Church, which teaches that the body and blood of Christ are indeed *received by the faithful* in the Lord's Supper, but only *in a heavenly and spiritual manner*, and that the bread and the wine in this sacrament, like the water in the sacrament of baptism, are not changed in their material nature, but only consecrated, as *sacred emblems*, to a holy and religious use. We showed that the figurative

language of our Lord was admirably calculated to set forth the cardinal doctrine of the Gospel, that our incorporation with him was essential to our justification and redemption; and that this blessed sacrament was mercifully ordained, not only as a sign but as a means of grace, to promote the work of this incorporation, that Christ might be in us, and we in him. We proved, as I trust sufficiently, that the Roman Catholic interpretation was inconsistent with Scripture, and at war with sense and reason; because we could only have the testimony of our eyes to prove that the words spoken by our Lord—*This is my body—this is my blood*—were in the Bible; and we had the testimony of the same eyes, with the touch, the taste, and the smell besides, to prove that the bread continued to be bread and not flesh, and that the wine continued to be wine and not blood, so that before we could believe their doctrine we must cease to believe our senses—or rather, what is still more absurd, we must believe ONE sense, in order to know that the Redeemer uttered the words at all, and we must contradict FOUR senses in order to receive the Roman interpretation. We presented a slight sketch of the rise and history of this doctrine of transubstantiation in the last portion of our discourse, and we promised to take up the evidence of the fathers on the present occasion, so as to show, conclusively, from the witnesses to which the Church of Rome most confidently appeals, that the writers of the primitive and ancient Church held *not their* interpretation, but our own.

To this portion of our undertaking, brethren, I would now invite your attention, only reminding you that we never place the testimony of Christian antiquity upon an equality with the only infallible rule or law of faith, the written Word of God; but consider it in the same light as we do the opinions of the judges in construing the laws of the land, liable indeed to error, yet, amongst human opinions, entitled to the highest respect. I would further request you to bear

in mind, that in consulting the opinions of the primitive Church, we are under the disadvantage of taking only those authors which the Church of Rome has herself thought fit to hand down, for the rest are lost to us. Yet, amongst those very works, we can find evidence enough to demonstrate clearly, that the doctrine before us is no offspring of those purer and better ages of the Church, but, in truth, an absolute innovation.

I commence with Irenæus, the bishop of Lyons, A. D. 170, who speaks of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or the Eucharist, in these words :

“ We offer to him, therefore, those things which are his own, proclaiming the communication and the unity of the flesh and the spirit. For in like manner as the bread which is from the earth, receiving the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, the earthly and the heavenly, so our bodies, receiving the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection.”* Here we perceive, brethren, with considerable clearness, that Irenæus considered the heavenly gift granted in the Eucharist to be the immortal life of the body from the grave. But the passage furnishes proof in two respects, that he could not have believed in transubstantiation ; for first he tells us, that the bread, after the invocation of God, is no longer *common* bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, the earthly and the heavenly ; whereas, upon the Roman Catholic hypothesis, he should have said that it was no longer *bread at all*, but under the veil or appearance of bread, was transubstantiated into the body and blood, soul and divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. And secondly, he makes a comparison which is totally hostile to their doctrine. For as the bread, after consecration, saith Irenæus, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, the earthly and the heavenly,

* See Iren. Tom. i. p. 251.

even so our bodies receiving the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the *hope* of the resurrection. Now here he plainly compares the change which takes place in the bread, to the change which takes place in the body of the receiver, which is manifestly not a change of *substance*, but a spiritual quality, to be developed in the last day.

Our next witness, however, the famous Tertullian, about thirty years later than Irenæus, will yield us an abundant expression of sentiment upon the subject. And first, let us hear him upon the great principle of adherence to the testimony of the senses.

“It is not allowable for us,” saith he, “to cast doubt upon the testimony of the senses, lest the facts of Christ’s history be destroyed, for it may then be said that he falsely saw Satan fall from heaven, or that he falsely heard the voice of the Father bearing witness of him, or that he was deceived when he touched the mother-in-law of Peter—or *that the flavour was something else than of wine, which he consecrated in memory of his blood.* For thus it is that the heretic Marcion wishes to believe that he was a phantasm, despising the verity of his whole bodily nature. But nature did not thus make a mockery of the apostles. Faithful was their sight and hearing on the mount; faithful their taste of the wine which had been water, in the marriage of Galilee; faithful the touch of Thomas who was thereby made a believer. Read the testimony of John: ‘That which we have seen,’ saith he, ‘which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes and our hands have handled, of the Word of life. But all this testimony is false, *if nature lies to us in the senses of the eyes, and the ears, and the hands.*’” (Tert. de Anima, p. 276.)

Again, pursuing the same argument against the heretic Marcion, Tertullian asks this significant question. “Shall I believe the Lord concerning the *interior* substance, who has deceived me concerning the *exterior*? If he is fallacious

in what is manifest, how shall he be true in what is concealed?" (Tert. adv. Mar. Lib. 3, p. 401.) Here, brethren, we have a forcible rebuke of the absurd pretence, which demands the utter subversion of the testimony of our senses in the question of the bread and wine in the holy Eucharist. For if our blessed Redeemer requires us to believe, that after the prayer of the priest, a little wafer has become transubstantiated into his own body, soul and divinity, and that under this appearance, he designs himself to be actually taken into the mouth and swallowed by every communicant, while the eyes, and the sense, and the touch, and the taste, all testify that it is but a wafer still, there is an end at once of reliance upon the senses, and there is no test remaining by which it is possible to distinguish between truth and error.

But on the express point of the Eucharist itself, we find Tertullian using language totally at variance with the Church of Rome: "The Lord in the Gospel," saith he, (Tert. adv. Mar. Lib. 3, p. 408,) "shewed bread, calling it his body, in order that you might thence understand him *to have given to the bread* THE FIGURE OF HIS BODY." Again, (adv. Mar. Lib. 4, p. 457,) "Our Lord," saith Tertullian, "taking the bread and distributing it to his disciples, *made it his body by saying, THIS IS MY BODY, that is, the figure of my body.*" "And that you may recognize an ancient figure of blood, in wine," continues Tertullian, "Isaias will teach you saying, (63 ch.) 'Who is this that cometh from Edom, with red garments from Bozrah—I have trodden the wine-press alone,—and their blood is sprinkled upon my garments, and I have stained all my apparel.' And still more clearly in the book of Genesis, where Jacob in the blessing of Judah, delineates Christ: 'He washed his robe in wine, and his garment in the blood of the grape;' indicating his flesh in the clothing, and his blood in the wine. Thus now he consecrates his blood in wine, as then he figured wine for his

blood." (*ib.* 458.) Here we have the plainest declaration of the true scriptural doctrine, that the bread is *the figure* of the body, and the wine *the figure* of the blood of Christ; and that these figures were not instituted for the first time when our Lord administered the sacrament, but were established in the language of prophecy long before.

I shall add but one other passage from this celebrated witness of Christian antiquity; and that is in reference to the sacrifice of which the prophet Malachi speaks, and which the Roman Church interprets to be the sacrifice of Christ himself upon the altar. "From the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same," saith the prophet, "my name shall be glorified, and in every place sacrifice shall be offered to my name, and a clean sacrifice, namely," saith Tertullian, "*the simple prayer of a pure conscience.*" (Tert. adv. Marc. lib. iv. p. 413, 414.)

Thus, then, brethren, we have the voice of the primitive Church, so early as A. D. 200, strongly insisting on the evidence of the senses, which transubstantiation would destroy, saying that Christ consecrated the wine in memory of his blood, and the bread as a figure of his body, and declaring that the sacrifice of the altar which the transubstantialist would call the offering of Christ himself, is the offering of prayer from a pure heart.*

Let us next inquire what testimony the distinguished Cyprian, bishop of Carthage and a martyr, will give; and we shall find him furnishing a very interesting confutation of the Church of Rome, in the whole of her modern doctrine. It appears that some foolish persons, in Cyprian's days, had undertaken to administer the Eucharist with water only, without wine. In reproving them, he quotes the apostle Paul's declaration to the Corinthians, where he says that he had received from the Lord that which he had also delivered

* Irenæus also interprets the incense mentioned by Malachi to be *the prayers of the saints*, p. 249, § 6.

unto them, and adds the strong expression of the apostle to the Galatians, *If we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel than that ye have received, let him be accursed.* “Since, therefore,” saith Cyprian, (ep. 118, p. 63,) “neither the apostle nor an angel from heaven could teach otherwise, than Christ had once taught, and his apostles had delivered, I wonder greatly from whence this novelty has arisen, in certain places, that against the evangelical and apostolical discipline, water is offered in the cup of the Lord, which can never, by itself, express the blood of Christ.”—“For the water *signifies the people*: as the divine Scripture declares in the Apocalypse, The waters which thou sawest, upon which the harlot sat, are peoples, and tribes, and nations, and tongues. Which thing we behold contained in the sacrament of the cup. For as Christ carried us all by bearing our sins, we see that the people are signified by the water, while by the wine he shows the blood of Christ. Therefore when the water is mixed with the wine in the cup, the people are united with Christ, and the whole host of believers is conjoined and incorporated with him in whom they believe. Now this comixture and conjunction of the water and the wine, in the chalice of the Lord, is so intimate, that they can never be separated from each other; and hence we learn that the Church can never be separated from Christ.—And thus it is manifest, that in consecrating the chalice or cup, water alone cannot be offered, nor yet wine alone, *for if any one offers wine alone, the blood of Christ begins to be without us; but if the water be alone, the people begin to be without Christ*; but when both are mixed together, then the spiritual and celestial sacrament is perfected. And as the cup of the Lord is not water only, nor wine only, but both united, in like manner the body of the Lord is not flour alone, nor water alone, but both united together, so as to form one solid mass of bread. By which is also signified our people united together, *for as many grains of wheat collected in one, and*

ground and mixed, make one bread, so in Christ, who is the bread from heaven, we know there is one body, to which our assembly is united and conjoined. Now," continues Cyprian, "that Christ alone is to be heard, even the Father himself declared from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear him. Wherefore, if Christ is to be heard, we ought not to heed what any others before us may have thought proper to be done, but what Christ, who is before all, authorized. Nor is it fit that we should follow the custom of men, but the truth of God, as God himself declares by the prophet Isaiah, In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men; which the Lord repeats in the Gospel, saying, Ye reject the commandment of God that ye may keep your own tradition." (Ib. 120.) "But all the discipline of religion and truth is subverted, unless that which is spiritually commanded is faithfully retained." This long extract, brethren, from one of the most distinguished of the fathers, gives us the voice of the primitive Church in the year 250; and you perceive how distinctly it declares, that the bread and the wine were not regarded as transubstantiated into the actual flesh and blood of Christ, but as figures or emblems merely. This is most manifest from the mixture of the water with the wine, which Cyprian insists upon so strongly, because he uses the very same words in reference to the figurative character of both, the wine signifying the blood, and the water, the people. Nothing can more fully prove that Cyprian had no idea of any change like transubstantiation; for the same principle which called for the conversion of the wine into the actual blood, would have called for the conversion of the water into the company of believers; and so the cup would contain, not only the blood of the Redeemer, but the whole host of the redeemed.

This is a difficulty which should, of itself, have put an end to the attempt to establish this most unhappy and mon-

strous innovation. For the Church of Rome still retains the ancient custom of mingling a little water with the wine, and if we ask them what becomes of the water, when the wine is changed into the blood, and the bread into the flesh of the Redeemer, there is no answer ready which can at all consist with the doctrine of transubstantiation.

But the most striking point of contrast between this venerable martyr and them, is shown in their boldly taking the cup away from the people altogether, as if it were a mere superfluity. Alas! how strange an inconsistency with the authority of that very apostolical tradition which they profess to venerate. Cyprian, one of their own most esteemed saints, with the whole primitive Church upon the one hand, carefully guarding the rule laid down by Christ, and exclaiming strongly against any innovation; and the modern Church of Rome, in the Council of Constance, so lately as A. D. 1415, on the other, ordering that the laity should not receive the cup at all, and that those who presumed to condemn this change should be punished as heretics,—yes, *heretics!* if they dared to prefer the example of Christ, and the practice of the Church for fourteen hundred years together, to the decrees of the pope and the Council. Who can avoid the emotions of astonishment and grief, at such a comment upon the claims of infallibility!

But let us summon for our next witness the admirable Ambrose, bishop of Milan, another of the saints canonized by the Church of Rome, in whose testimony we shall find several sentences which strongly resemble the Roman doctrine, while nevertheless we shall see, when we have the whole, that he is decidedly opposed to it.

“The Lord Jesus himself proclaims: *This is my body,*” saith Ambrose. “Before the benediction of the celestial words, it is called another thing; after consecration it signifies his body. He declares his blood. Before consecration it is a different thing, after consecration it is called his blood.

And thou sayest Amen: that is, It is true. What thy mouth hath spoken, let thine inward mind confess: what thy speech pronounces, let thine affections feel." (Amb. op. Tom. ii. p. 339, 340. § 54.)

"Again," saith Ambrose, "Who is the author of the sacraments, but the Lord Jesus? From heaven the sacraments came, for all his counsel is of heaven. But thou perhaps wilt say, My bread is common bread. And so it is, before the sacramental words. When consecration comes, then of the bread is made the flesh of Christ. But how can that which is bread become the body of Christ? By consecration. And by whose words is this consecration? By those of the Lord Jesus. For all the rest are said by the priest: praises are given to God, prayer is offered for the people, for kings, for others; but when he comes to prepare the venerable sacrament, the priest no longer uses his own words, but the words of Christ. Therefore the word of Christ makes the sacrament." (Ibid. 368.)

Now thus far, brethren, although the language of Ambrose is susceptible of a very sound interpretation, yet it must be confessed that the general strain of it seems rather favourable to the doctrine we are opposing. But we next present to you the key of his meaning, which will explain those expressions clearly.

"That I may further answer thee," saith Ambrose, "it was not the body of Christ before consecration, but after consecration I tell thee that it is the body of Christ. He said, and it was done; he commanded, and it was created. *Thou also wast; but thou wast the old creature: after thou wert consecrated thou didst begin to be a new creature. Dost thou desire to know how? Every one, saith he, who is in Christ, is a new creature.*" (Ibid. 369.)

Here we perceive how far this venerable father was from teaching transubstantiation, since he compares the change which consecration produces on the bread and wine, to the

change which a similar consecration produces on the believer. But no one supposes that the Spirit of God, in making the new creature, through a change of heart and the sacrament of baptism, effects any thing like transubstantiation. The believer retains the same soul and the same body which he had before. The change is a change of *character* and not of *substance*, so that no analogy could more clearly prove how well the doctrine of this witness accords with that of the other, and how completely it stands opposed to the subsequent innovation.

He passes on to several other illustrations of the power of God, in not one of which is there the slightest presence of transubstantiation, (p. 370,) and then proceeds as follows :

“ Perhaps, however, you will say, I do not see the appearance of blood. BUT IT HAS A SIMILITUDE: *for as you have taken the similitude of death, even so thou drinkest the similitude of precious blood, that there may be no horror of blood itself, and yet the price of your redemption might be available.* And thus you have learned that what you receive is the body of Christ.” Here we see a still further development of his idea, for instead of answering the objection like a believer in transubstantiation, he takes the true ground, that the thing which the eyes beheld was only *a similitude, or a figure*. His doctrine was, that by the power of Christ after the words of consecration, the bread and wine became the body and blood of Christ in a symbolical sense, and that he who faithfully received them was made partaker of the Saviour’s body and blood, after a heavenly and spiritual manner. The objector is supposed to answer, that he could not understand how this could be so, because he saw no appearance of blood in the cup. Does Ambrose reply that it was actual blood notwithstanding? that the appearance was only a veil? that he must not credit his senses? or does he urge a single argument that resembles the modern reasoning of the Church of Rome? Not at all. On

the contrary, he replies, that the object which he saw *had a similitude*, that as he had undergone the *similitude of death* in baptism, so he drank the *similitude of Christ's blood* in the sacrament, and that nothing more than a similitude was intended by the outward symbol or sign, because *real blood would affect him with horror*. What can be less like the reasoning of a transubstantialist than this? and what can better accord with our doctrine, that the communication of the body and blood of Christ is not after a carnal but after a heavenly and spiritual manner?

I shall notice but one testimony more, from the writings of Ambrose; but it is one of far higher importance than his individual opinion, because it gives us the language of the liturgy used in his time, in the very prayer of consecration.

“Listen,” saith he, “to the celestial words of consecration. The priest saith, ‘Make this to us, O Lord, a chosen, allowed, reasonable and acceptable sacrifice, which is *the figure* of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.’ (p. 371.) And again, after consecration, the priest continues his prayer in these words: ‘Therefore, O Lord, being mindful of his most glorious passion and his resurrection from the dead, and his ascension into heaven, we offer to thee this immaculate sacrifice, this reasonable sacrifice, this unbloody sacrifice, *this holy bread and cup of life eternal*, and we pray and beseech thee that thou wouldst receive this offering on thy sublime altar by the hands of thine angels, as thou didst vouchsafe to receive the gifts of thy righteous servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and that which the highest priest, Melchisedec, offered to thee.’” (pp. 372, 380, 381; as also Tom. i. p. 1411.)

Now here we have the strongest testimony of the worship of the Church in the days of Ambrose; and in it the Lord is besought to make the bread and wine become the *figure* of Christ's body and blood, which word *figure* is an absolute proof against the whole Roman doctrine. And in

complete accordance with the same idea, it is called, *after consecration, the holy bread and cup of life eternal*. So that the whole testimony here afforded to us, as to the main point, is distinctly in favour of the Scriptural doctrine, and totally incompatible with transubstantiation.

We pass on next to Augustin, the bishop of Hippo, who was the scholar of Ambrose, but went far beyond his teacher in learning and in talent. The great number of his writings, and the uncommon importance of his authority in the judgment of the Church of Rome, will call for a correspondent attention to his declarations.

To commence with an interesting statement on the sacraments in general, Augustin saith, "If the sacraments had not *a certain similitude of those things*, of which they are the sacraments, they could not be sacraments at all. But from this similitude, for the most part, *they take the names of the things themselves*. Thus, therefore, *according to a certain mode, the sacrament of Christ's body is the body of Christ, and the sacrament of Christ's blood is the blood of Christ*, and in like manner, the *sacrament of faith*, (meaning Baptism) *is faith*.—Hence the Apostle saith, speaking of Baptism, *we are buried by Baptism into death*. He does not say, We have set forth the *sign of burial*, but he saith, *We are buried*. He calls the *sacrament* of the thing by the *word belonging to the thing itself*." (Aug. op. Tom. ii. p. 202, 3, § 9.) Here our author gives us the sound rule which governs the name applied to the blessed Eucharist, but which is totally hostile to the Roman doctrine. It is called the body and blood of Christ, saith the Church of Rome, because the bread and wine are *actually transubstantiated into Christ's flesh and blood*. Nay, saith Augustine, but because they have *a certain similitude to Christ's body and blood*, therefore they are called by the *name of those things which they represent*. The opposition is plain and palpable.

Again, let us take the great rule of Scriptural interpretation from Augustin's comment on the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, where it is usually understood, by the divines on both sides, that our Lord was speaking of the Eucharist. "If a preceptive speech," saith Augustin, either forbids a crime or a sin, or orders something useful or beneficent, it is not figurative. But if it appears to order a crime or a sin, or to forbid something useful or beneficent, it is figurative. *Unless you shall eat, saith our Lord, the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall have no life in you.* Here he seems to order a *crime or an outrage, and therefore it is a figure, directing the communion of our Lord's passion, and that we should sweetly and usefully lay up in our memory, that for us his flesh was crucified and wounded.*" (Ib. Tom. iii. p. 40, § 24.) We perceive, brethren, in this passage, that the modern Church of Rome and St. Augustin are completely at issue; for they insist that our Lord meant to be understood *literally*; whereas Augustin expressly saith, as we do, that he spake *figuratively*.

Again, "The Lord," saith Augustin, "being about to give the Holy Spirit, saith, that he is the bread which cometh down from heaven, exhorting us to believe in him. For *to believe in him, is to eat the living bread. He who believes, eats,* he is invisibly nourished, because he is invisibly regenerated." (Tom. iii. par. ii. p. 358. § 1.)

Again, "Augustin repeats the language of our Lord, *This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that if any one eat thereof, he shall not die.*" "But this," observes our author, "belongs to the *virtue* of the sacrament, not to the *visible sacrament*; the promise is to him who eats *inwardly*, not outwardly; not to him who presses with his teeth, *but to him who eats in his heart.*" (Ib. § 12.)

Again, in a very interesting little discourse to the young, Augustin saith: "I promised to you who are newly bap-

tized, a sermon in which I should explain the sacrament of the Lord's table, which you now behold, and of which you were, last night, made partakers. You ought to know what you have received, what you are hereafter to receive, what you should receive daily. The bread which you see upon the altar, sanctified by the Word of God, is the body of Christ. The cup, or rather that which the cup contains, is the blood of Christ. By these things the Lord Christ designs to commend his body and blood, which he shed for us in the remission of our sins. If you have partaken of them rightly, YOU ARE WHAT YOU HAVE RECEIVED. For the apostle saith, *We being many, are one bread and one body.* He thus expounds the sacrament of the Lord's table: We being many, are one bread and one body. In this bread, therefore, is commended to you how you ought to love unity." (Ib. p. 677-8 § 1.)

Here, brethren, is another plain proof that Augustin was no believer of transubstantiation. "*You are,*" saith he, "*what you have received.*" This is easily understood in an orthodox sense, if we remember that the consecrated bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ *figuratively and mystically*, because the Church is also the body of Christ, *figuratively and mystically*. But if the bread and the wine were transubstantiated into his *natural flesh and blood*, as the Roman Catholic system declares, St. Augustin's language would be absurd; for no one imagines that the whole company of the faithful become the body of Christ in a carnal sense like this.

He proceeds, however, to make his meaning still more clear: "These mysteries or sacraments," saith he, "are great; yea, very great. Therefore the Apostle saith, Whosoever eateth and drinketh unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. What is it to receive unworthily? To receive in mockery, to receive in disdain, or disregard. Let not that seem to you mean or vile, which you

behold. What you see passes away ; but what is signified, invisible, does not pass away, but remains. Behold, the one is received, is eaten, is consumed ; *but is the body of Christ consumed? is the Church of Christ consumed? are the members of Christ consumed?* God forbid. Here they are cleansed ; there they are crowned. That which is signified therefore remains eternally, although that which is seen passes away. So do ye then receive, that you may have unity in your heart : let your hearts remain lifted up, let your hope not be in earth, but in heaven." (Ib. 678.)

After this beautiful and strong passage, I shall add but little more from Augustin, but that little is decisive, even if we had nothing besides. "Our Lord," saith he, "did not hesitate to say, *This is my body*, when he gave them *the sign* of his body." (Tom. viii. p. 90, § 3.) Once more, treating of an objection foolishly raised against the application of marriage by St. Paul, to the union between Christ and the Church, Augustin says : "The sacraments or mysteries are *sacred signs*," and as an illustration he turns to the Lord's supper : "Thus we acknowledge," continues he, "the mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, giving to us his flesh to eat and his blood to drink ; and we receive it with faithful heart and mouth, although it would seem more horrible to eat human flesh than to perish, and to drink human blood than to be destroyed ; and in like manner, through all the holy Scriptures, according to the rule of the true faith, if any thing is said or done *in a figure*, and the exposition is drawn from those words and things which are contained in the sacred pages, let us listen wisely and not disdainfully ; and let us leave this talker of emptiness, who really knows not what he says, in his unskilful handling the quality of *figures of speech*." (Tom. viii. p. 425, § 33.)

To these conclusive and multiplied testimonies from this most distinguished of the fathers, brethren, a few short ex-

tracts from some other great authors may perhaps be joined, although it be unnecessary.

Cyril, the bishop of Jerusalem, is often quoted by the writers on the other side as favourable to their doctrine, but I shall present to you a passage from his works which I think clearly decisive against them.

Speaking of the vow in Baptism, to renounce Satan and all his pomps, he includes within the meaning of this vow the bread and flesh which the heathen were accustomed to devote to their idols on their festivals; and then he makes this comparison: "For just as the bread and wine of the Eucharist, before the sacred invocation of the adorable Trinity, were *mere bread and wine*, but after this invocation the bread becomes the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ, *so, and in the same manner, the articles of food belonging to the pomps of Satan, although by their nature they are common, are rendered profane and contaminated by the invocation of demons.*" (Cyr. Hier. Cat. xix. Mystag. i. p. 308.) I do not see, brethren, how such a comparison could ever have been made by a transubstantialist; for certainly, just as St. Paul sets the table of the Lord in opposition to the table of devils, Cyril sets the Eucharist in opposition to the bread and flesh offered in the idol feast. But surely he would not have done this if he had believed, that the bread and wine of the Eucharist had vanished in the prayer of consecration, and that in their place was the body and blood, soul and divinity, of the Lord Jesus.

In the following century, namely, the fifth, we find pope Leo the great, strongly condemning the error of some who refused the wine in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. "They receive the body of Christ," saith he, "with unworthy mouth, but they altogether decline receiving the blood of our redemption. Wherefore we make it known to you, that men of this description, whose sacrilegious hypocrisy is de-

clared by such signs, be driven by the authority of the priesthood from the society of the faithful." (Leon. Mag. Tom. i. p. 106.) How wonderful the change, brethren, that the sacramental blood which pope Leo in the fifth century, expelled these men for refusing to take, the Church of Rome, some nine centuries afterwards, and ever since, should refuse to give them.

But here we must close our extracts from the fathers, although a large mass of testimony remains behind. Enough, however, I trust, has been cited, to prove that the primitive Church of Christ knew nothing of this doctrine, which has become, in modern days, so prominent a peculiarity of the Church of Rome; so that we are again compelled to accuse her of a total disregard to every principle of authority, whether divine or human, in her wilful determination to raise her own notions of expediency above the Word of God, the voice of Christian antiquity, the testimony of sense, and the judgment of right reason.

For what, I beseech you, becomes of her reverence for the authority of our Lord, when she dares openly to forbid, to all her laity, the sacred cup of the Sacrament, which He commanded to be received; and even fulminates her curse against those, who presume to prefer the precept of Christ before the decree of her miscalled General Council?

What becomes of her boasted agreement with the fathers, when their uniform judgment, pronouncing the consecrated elements to be only a *type* and a *figure*, is distorted from its true meaning; while she proclaims another solemn curse against the doctrine of the very saints whom she has placed upon her own calendar?

What becomes of her regard to the testimony of the senses, when her doctrine of transubstantiation, entering by *one* sense, is made to bear down and destroy the evidence of *four* senses, pronouncing the very contrary?

What becomes of her respect for the judgment of right rea-

son, when she asserts a *miracle* without an atom of the only evidence to which all other miracles appeal, namely, the evidence of the senses, and commands a species of idolatry more revolting than any which the world has ever known? Absurd, indeed, was the heathen belief, that a Deity was inclosed within the sun, the moon, and the stars—or within the body of some living animal—or within an image, whether framed by the exquisite art of the Grecian sculptor, or roughly hewn by the hand of barbarian skill. But no heathenism has ever so outraged all right reason, as the doctrine which invests a little wafer, in the hands of a priest, with the incarnate majesty of the Son of God, and denounces the eternal anathema of the Almighty upon all who refuse to fall down and worship it. And if the blessed Reformation had been excited by no other cause, than this fearful corruption and mutilation of the truth and integrity of the great Christian Sacrament, that alone would have been an ample justification. Nor would the glorious company of our martyrs have needed a better argument for departing from the communion of Rome than the simple fact, that it was no longer possible to enjoy, in her maimed and superstitious ritual, *the Eucharistic feast*, AS IT WAS COMMANDED BY THE SAVIOUR.

And now, my beloved brethren, as I design to continue this course of lectures no further, you will indulge me with a few concluding observations, to sum up the whole. Many and most serious, indeed, are the topics which I have left untouched. The Roman doctrine of Justification, their priestly powers of absolution, their system of the confessional, their works of penance, their maxims of morality, especially as they are presented by their distinguished Jesuits, their mode of religious teaching, so disconnected from the Scriptures, the privileges granted to their monastic orders, the effects attributed to the baptism of bells, and the sign of the cross, and the aspersion of holy water, with a considerable list of kindred subjects, would furnish a large scope for important

and interesting discussion. But my object has not been so much to attempt a full and complete examination of their entire system, as to select a few of the more prominent points which their modern advocates are in the habit of defending; and to show, by a thorough examination of these alone, the absolute necessity which called for the Reformation, the principles upon which it was conducted in our mother Church, and its great results in purifying the whole religious atmosphere of Europe, including even the practical aspect of Rome herself, at least in Protestant countries.

With this design, I have passed in review the subject of the rule of faith, embracing the comparative rights of the Bible and tradition; the claims of celibacy in the priesthood, the monks and the nuns; the supremacy of the pope; the worship of the virgin and the saints, of relics and of images; the doctrines of persecution, purgatory, satisfaction and indulgences, and lastly transubstantiation. In all of these we have seen a certain portion of truth, exaggerated, distorted, and deformed, until it ended in the most extravagant error; and in every single item of the melancholy list, we have found sufficient cause for the work of the Reformation; while the aggregate forms a mass of superstition and abuse, which only excites the deepest regret and astonishment that such a Reformation should have been so long delayed, and that the light and knowledge brought in by its instrumentality, should have still left so much darkness and ignorance remaining, throughout the great body of Christendom.

We have also seen, in some measure, how we might account for these various corruptions of the Church. Multitudes of her converts had been heathen, of talents, learning, and philosophical reputation. These naturally inclined to indulge their old habits of thought, by engrafting them, as much as possible, upon the pure Gospel: and this was one source of error. Multitudes of others were politicians, courtiers, men of the world; who, when the conversion of the

Roman emperor Constantine, in A. D. 312, made Christianity the established and the fashionable religion, exerted all their influence to invest it with every attraction which might serve to gratify and please the bulk of the people: and here was a kind of policy which proved another source of error.

Then came the temptation of the love of power, which made the superior orders of the clergy too often forget the proper duties of their sacred office, in the paramount object of securing the *empire of the Church*, by which was really meant, *their own*. While the fierce rivalry, the unhallowed contentions, and the lordly claims of these worldly-minded prelates, gave increasing influence to the opposite class of mystic and contemplative pictists, who withdrew from the world and the public glare of ostentation, to bury themselves in a gloomy seclusion; and thus, the power of superstition, and mortification, and self-imposed austerities, established a false but most impressive kind of sanctity, which led mankind still further away from the precepts and example of the Saviour.

And then, the most powerful, perhaps, of all second causes, the decline and fall of the Roman empire, ushered in the long ages of barbarism, ignorance, feudal servitude, and bondage, both of mind and body, which offered the strongest inducements to the spiritual despotism of the popes, and even recommended every ingenious contrivance, by which the wild license of warriors, barons, and belted knights, should be held in check, through the force of pious frauds, and salutary terrors. And thus, stage after stage, the immense fabric of ecclesiastical dominion was carried to such a height, that the pope became the master of kings and emperors; the priests became the sovereigns of the people; the mild Gospel of mercy became associated with the tortures of the inquisition; the sword, and the prison, and the stake, became the converters of heretics and the guardians of the faith; until, at last, the name of a priest, or a monk, was almost a con-

vertible term for immorality and abomination. The worse the Church became, the more she insisted on her infallibility; and thousands of the better and more reflecting class began to think, that the Temple of God had indeed become the synagogue of Satan.

At length came the hour of successful resistance—the struggle of the Reformation. The holy Scriptures were restored to their rightful ascendancy, the testimony of the earlier fathers was set against the corrupt innovations of later times—the Church in many quarters was cleansed from the accumulated pollution of centuries—the Gospel of truth was proclaimed with honest zeal by a great company of fearless preachers—and a large proportion of Europe shook off the yoke of papal usurpation, to be oppressed by it no more. Bright was the prospect which cheered the hopes of the reformers at this mighty change, and vast has been the advantage to all the best interests of the civilized world. But alas! after three hundred years have rolled away, the result is far from being so complete as might have been anticipated. Liberty has brought along with it careless neglect. Freedom from the yoke has multiplied dissensions. The chains of superstition are converted into the bondage of the world, and the Church of Rome, with improved morals and more moderate claims, derives an argument of increasing strength from the divisions of Protestants, talks of regaining her old dominion, and looks forward to the ultimate consolidation of the whole earth beneath her sceptre.

Under such circumstances, brethren, it must surely be admitted, that those who are the descendants of the reformers should look well to their Christian privileges, and to their Christian responsibility. Reproachful and dangerous as it is, at all times, to be ignorant or careless about our religious principles, it is doubly so at a time like this. The cause of the Reformation is the cause of God, because it asserts the rightful supremacy of the Bible—the word of God—

over the false, the superstitious, and the debasing scheme of human, or worse than human invention. And if the success of the Reformation has not been such, as its pure and sacred system would have led us to anticipate, let us remember that the same remark is yet more applicable to the Gospel itself. Shall men be allowed to say that the Reformation is a failure, because strife and dissension abound amongst the ranks of Protestants, and even our own beloved and well-ordered Church is not wholly at rest? Shall they be allowed to say that the Reformation is a failure, because the Church of Rome still stands in strength and majesty, proclaiming her unchangeableness, and predicting her final victory? As well may they tell us that Christianity has been a failure, because Christendom itself is in subjection to the world, and the hearts of men are still corrupt and selfish, and infidelity walks side by side with faith, and the Church Universal is rent into hostile divisions, and darkness still shrouds the sight of Israel, and the false prophet still keeps millions in bondage, and paganism still holds down more than half the race of man, although eighteen centuries have rolled their round, since the sublime commencement of the apostolic Church on the day of Pentecost.

But false, and ungrateful, and absurd would it be esteemed by every candid mind, to argue thus with respect to Christianity. Incalculable are the blessings which the world owes to the Gospel, notwithstanding the prevalence of evil; and if it has not effected all that might have been anticipated, the fault is not in the Gospel, but in those who refuse to adopt it. Precisely in the same manner may we decide the question concerning the good effects of the Reformation. Its great leading principle was, the re-publication of the Book of God, which, for ages, had been thrust aside to make way for the authority of the Church, and the heavy yoke of human tradition. And vast have been its blessed results in every quarter of Christendom. It has disarmed the ecclesiastical

oppressor, restored the primitive faith, overthrown the Inquisition, burst the captive's chains, opened the prison doors, quenched the flames of torture, established the claims of conscience, purified the lives of the priesthood, diffused useful knowledge, restrained the tyranny of monarchs, and recognized, on the broad scale of the divine judgment, the temporal and eternal rights of man. Nay, the Church of Rome herself has felt the benign influence, which, although it has indeed changed none of her dangerous and anti-Christian principles, has yet, wherever she comes into contact with Protestants, modified and improved their practical application. No man of intelligence and observation can be ignorant, that a purer standard of morals, a higher mark of general intelligence, a more elevated tone of instruction, and a serious decrease of superstition, distinguish the Church of Rome, in Protestant countries, from the same Church elsewhere. So that if she dare be just, without regard to policy, even Rome herself would be compelled to acknowledge the benefits of the Reformation.

Far be it from us, however, to presume on the righteousness of our cause, as an excuse for sloth or negligence. It is a time, not for pride and boasting, but for repentance and humility—not for blind confidence and apathy, but for watchfulness and prayer. It is a time when the true-hearted sons of the Reformation should cast away their prejudices, and strifes, and divisions; seek for the things that make for peace, and, firmly united among themselves, contend for the faith once delivered to the saints—not in bitterness, nor in wrath, nor in evil-speaking, but in soundness of speech, and ripeness of knowledge—meekly instructing all who oppose the truth, and especially laboring for the benefit of that Church of Rome, which it is our duty to regard with the love of benevolence, notwithstanding all her grievous errors, for the sake of the multitudes who belong to her corrupt communion. The Reformers themselves, with millions of

their countrymen, were once involved in the same darkness. Why, then, should we despair of the further progress of the Reformation? Why may we not hope that the Church of Rome might yet be led to see her errors, and be restored to her original purity? Why should we not make it, so far as we have opportunity, a subject of our efforts, our wishes, and our supplications? Are we content to be of the number whose strength is to sit still? Are we willing to expose ourselves to the woe pronounced against those who are at ease in Zion?

But prayers and efforts in behalf of Rome may be derided by some, on the strength of prophecy. Is not Rome **BABYLON**? Is not the pope **ANTICHRIST**? And must not Babylon fall? And shall not Antichrist be destroyed by the brightness of the Redeemer's coming? Assuredly, my brethren, Babylon must fall, and Antichrist must be destroyed, *for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it*. But may not Babylon signify her princely dominion, her pomp and pride? May not Antichrist signify her anathemas, her persecution, her idolatry, her assumed infallibility, her papal despotism? And is it not possible that the Church of Rome—such as she was when planted by apostolic hands, and such as she continued for the first few centuries—might again arise, when Babylon and Antichrist are both cast down forever? Is it inconsistent to think, that the awful corruptions figured by these names might all be cleansed away, while the ancient principles of faith, government and worship should remain; and thus while **POPERY** should indeed be overthrown, the primitive **CHURCH OF ROME** might be raised again to life amidst the ruin?

It is no part of my design, however, to enter upon the discussion of the prophecies connected with our subject. However we may interpret these Sacred Oracles, beloved brethren, we cannot err in humbly looking forward to the unfolding of those great events, which may, even now, be

nigh at hand. We cannot err in diligently striving to watch and labor, as good stewards, in our respective vocations. We cannot err in offering to the throne of grace the fervent and the constant prayer, that the pure faith of the Gospel may be established without any alloy of human invention—that the Church of Rome herself may be brought back to her own original standard—that the dissensions of Christendom may all be healed—that the kingdoms of our world may become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and that **THE WHOLE EARTH MAY BE FILLED WITH HIS GLORY.**

THE END.



Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01145 1491

